

स्वर्गवासी साधुचरित श्रीमान् डालचन्दजी सिंघी



जन्म

वि. सं. १९२१, मार्ग वदि ६

स्वर्गवास

वि. सं. १९८४, पौष सुदि ६

SINGHI JAINA SERIES

VOLUME 11



LIFE OF HEMACANDRĀCĀRYA

SINGHI JAINA SERIES

A COLLECTION OF CRITICAL EDITIONS OF MOST IMPORTANT CANONICAL, PHILOSOPHICAL,
HISTORICAL, LITERARY, NARRATIVE ETC WORKS OF JAINA LITERATURE
IN PRĀKRIT, SANSKRIT, APABHRANŚA AND OLD VERNACULAR
LANGUAGES, AND STUDIES BY COMPETENT
RESEARCH SCHOLARS

FOUNDED AND PUBLISHED

BY

ŚRĪMĀN BAHĀDUR SINGHJĪ SINGHĪ OF CALCUTTA

IN MEMORY OF HIS LATE FATHER

ŚRĪ DĀLCANDJĪ SINGHĪ.



GENERAL EDITOR

JINAVIJAYA MUNI

ADHIṢṬHĀTĀ: SINGHĪ JAINA JĀNAPĪṬHA, SĀNTINIKETAN.

HONORARY MEMBER OF THE BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF POONA AND GUJRAT
SAHITYA SABHA OF AHMEDABAD, FORMERLY PRINCIPAL OF GUJRAT PURATATTVAMANDIR
OF AHMEDABAD EDITOR OF MANY SANSKRIT, PRĀKRIT, PĀLI, APABHRANŚA,
AND OLD GUJRATI WORKS

NUMBER 11

TO BE HAD FROM

SAṆCĀLAKA, SINGHĪ JAINA GRANTHAMĀLĀ

BHARATINIVAS,
ELLIS BRIDGE
AHMEDABAD. (GUJRAT)



SINGHI SADAN,
48, GARIYAHAT ROAD,
BALLYGUNGE, CALCUTTA

Founded 1

All rights reserved

[1931. A. D.

THE
LIFE OF HEMACANDRĀCĀRYA

BY
PROFESSOR DR. G. BÜHLER
VIENNA

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL GERMAN
BY
PROFESSOR DR. MANILAL PATEL, PH. D. (MARBURG)
VIDYĀBHAVANA, VIŚVA-BHĀRATI, ŚĀNTINIKETAN.

WITH A FOREWORD
BY
PROFESSOR DR. M. WINTERNITZ, PH. D.,
PROFESSOR OF INDOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY AT THE GERMAN
UNIVERSITY OF PRAGUE (CZECHOSLOVAKIA),
SOMETIME VISITING PROFESSOR, VIŚVA-BHĀRATI.

PUBLISHED BY
THE ADHIṢṬHĀTĀ-SIŪGHĪ JAINA JĀNAPĪṬHA
ŚĀNTINIKETAN.

CONTENTS

| | PAGES. |
|---|---------|
| PREFACE | VII |
| PREFACE BY THE GENERAL EDITOR | IX-XII |
| FOREWORD | XIII-XV |
| CHAP. | |
| I. The Sources | 1-5 |
| II. Hemacandra's Youth | 6-11 |
| III. Hemacandra and Jayasīma-Siddharāja | 12-24 |
| IV. The Accounts regarding the First Acquaintance of Kumārapāla and Hemacandra | 25-27 |
| V. The Stories Regarding Kumārapāla's Conversion | 28-31 |
| VI. Hemacandra's own Account of Kumārapāla's Conversion | 32-40 |
| VII. The Consequences of Kumārapāla's Conversion | 41-47 |
| VIII. Hemacandra's Literary Works after Kumārapāla's Conversion | 48-50 |
| IX. Stories about the Intercourse between Hemacandra and Kumārapāla, and about their End | 51-57 |
| NOTES | 58-99 |
| INDEX | 100-103 |
| ERRATA | 104 |

PREFACE

The following essay is a translation of the late Professor G. Bühler's original German treatise entitled "Ueber das Leben des Jaina Mönches Hemacandra, des Schülers des Devachandra aus der Vajrasākhā," which appeared in the *Denkschriften der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Vienna, vol. xxxvii (1889), pp. 171-258.¹ Bühler's treatise has since remained the most authentic and thorough biographical statement on the life of Hemacandrācārya (1086-1173 A. D.), the most eminent Jaina (Śvetāmbara) monk and polymath of mediaeval Gujarat. A shrewd and talented exponent of his faith, Hemacandra won himself an undying name in the history of Jainism. He wielded great influence over Jayasimha Siddharāja (A. D. 1094-1143), one of the mightiest monarchs of Gujarat, and actually converted his successor, king Kumārāpala, so that the Jaina religion gained a firm footing in Gujarat, which has not been shaken as yet. Hemacandra was, moreover, one of the greatest Indian scholars of all time, whose vast learning and literary labours are sufficient to secure him an honoured place in the history of Indian Philology. His life should indeed be of great appeal and interest, not only to the students of Jainism but also to those of Sanskrit literature and of ancient Indian history and culture. None would therefore dispute the desirability of rescuing Bühler's masterly treatise on the life of Hemacandra from the almost obsolete files of the above-mentioned Viennese journal and of presenting an English version of the same so as to attract a wider circle of readers.

It only remains for me to perform the very pleasant task of expressing my deep gratitude to Muni Jinavijayaṇi and to Sjt. Bahādur Singhji Singhī, the editor and the founder of the *Singhi Jaina Series*, for their kind and helpful interest in my humble literary activities. I am also specially indebted to Professor Dr. M. Winternitz, who not only has kindly written the Foreword to this work but has also carefully read the printed forms in advance and suggested improvements, most of which are incorporated in the *Errata*. To my friend and colleague, Professor Krishna Kripalani, B. A., Bar-at-law, my thanks are due for his kindly going through the MS. with me.

Vidyabhavana,
Visva-Bharati,
SANTINIKETAN, }
July, 1936.

M. P.

-
- 1 Simultaneously also issued as a separate reprint.
 - 2 See also T. Zacharias, *Die ind. Wörterbücher* (= *GLAP*, I. 3b [1897]), pp. 30-35; H. Jacobi, *ERE*, vol. vi, p. 591; J. Hertel, *Ausgewählte Erzählungen aus Hemacandras Parīṣṭaparvan*, Leipzig (1908), Einleitung, pp. 1-5.
 - 3 According to Jacobi's calculation the birthdate of Hemacandra would be the 1st December, 1088 A. D., see Hertel, *ibid.* p. 1, n. 2.

PREFACE BY THE GENERAL EDITOR.

Professor George Buhler was one of those great German scholars to whom largely goes the credit for the developement of the science of Indology. His whole life was dedicated to the study and research of ancient Indian history and literature. Indian archeology and epigraphy are greatly indebted to this scholar for his contributions. He brought to bear upon these subjects a trained and unbiassed mind. His study of the history and literature of the Jaina religion was specially painstaking and sympathetic. Prof. Herman Jacobi derived great support from the researches of Dr. Buhler in refuting the view of Prof. Weber that Jainism was merely a sect of Buddhism and in establishing the antiquity and the independence of Jainism as a religious sect. Dr. Buhler's researches on the Jaina stupas at Mathura and inscriptions thereon deserve special mention.

He was the first scholar to discuss critically and exhaustively, as far as the material available to him allowed, the life and times of Hemacandra—one of the greatest figures of the Jaina Church. Dr. Buhler when an officer in the Educational Department of the Bombay Government had rare opportunities of visiting and examining some of the famous Jaina Bhandare of Gujrat and Rajputana. These investigations provided him with ample material which enabled him to prepare the present study on Hemacandra. He possessed that acumen and insight which made him appreciate the proper historical value of such Prabandha works as the *Prabhāvakacarita* and the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*.

The present study on the life of Hemacandra was first published in German language about fifty years back. Since that time much new material has been discovered which throws considerable light on the problems which were then obscure to this learned scholar.

The material on which he had to rely was then only in the form of MSS. which were defective in many ways. Most of it is now more or less critically edited and published. All the works of Hemacandra himself were also not available to him in properly edited and printed form. So it is but natural that in the light of this new and more adequate material some discrepancies should be discovered in this learned study.

Of the new material, that has been discovered since Dr Bühler published his study, the *Kumārāpalapratibodha* of Somaprabhacārya should be mentioned first. This work was completed in the year V S 1241 (= A D 1185) that is eleven years after the death of Hemacandra. It was composed and finished by Somaprabhacārya while residing at Anahillapura in the *tasati* (that is the residence) of the poet-laureate Śrīpāla. Three disciples of Hemacandra—namely Mahendra muni, Vardhamana muni and Guṇacandra gaṇi—had attended to it with great interest as it was being read to them. The first copies of the work were prepared by the order of Abhayakumara—a leading rich citizen of Anahillapura and a favourite of Kumārāpala. Thus this book is the work of a contemporary learned man who was in close contact of Hemacandra and his pupils and devotees. Though this work is voluminous, unfortunately it does not give as much information about the lives of Kumārāpala and Hemacandra as to satisfy our expectations. However whatever information it gives is quite reliable and of first class historical importance. Dr Bühler was altogether unaware of this work.

Next to this comes the *Moharajaparajaya* natak of Yasahpala a contemporary of Hemacandra and Kumārāpala. Dr Bühler was aware of this drama and had taken notice of it but it appears he had not himself gone through this work. If he had availed himself of both these works he would have been able to give a more accurate and satisfactory account of the conversion of Kumārāpala by Hemacandra.

In addition to these two literary works we have been fortunate enough to discover other historical references which help us in understanding more clearly and definitely matters which were regarded by Dr Bühler as doubtful or incapable of a consistent explanation. For example take the year of the conquest of Malava by Siddharāja. Now we have discovered certain colophons at the end of MSS which help us in settling this question. Again Dr Bühler has raised many doubts as to the reliability of the evidence which goes to show the influence of other learned Jaina Ācāryas on Siddharāja (Chapt IV p 33). These doubts get solved by the *prasasti* of V S 1193 at the end of the *Munisūratasamuccarita* of Candrāuri which is published in the fifth report of Prof Peterson (pp 7-18).

It appears that Dr Bühler could not go through all the works of Hemacandra carefully. Otherwise some of the mistakes could have been avoided. For example Bühler says—“In none of his works, known so far, does Hemacandra give the name of his teacher, although ample opportunity should have been offered for the same” (p 10). It is rather strange that Dr Bühler should pass such a remark. In fact in the *Trisastiśalākāpurāṣaṇa* from whose 10th parvan he gives copious quotations, Hemacandra not only refers to his Guru but says that it was through his *prasāda* (blessings) that he could be so rich in learning. * As Dr Bühler probably could not

* शिष्यत्वास च तीर्थयेदमने पावित्र्यकर्मस्य सदादिदृश्यापवादिसिद्धिर्निश्चयकोषार्थम् ।
हृत्वा स्थानकहृदि पातितवर्तिते प्राप्तं प्रतिदि पतं सुविस्मिताय प्रभाववति श्रीदेवचन्द्रोऽमवत् ॥ १४ ॥
आचार्यो देवचन्द्रोऽभूत्पादाम्बुनन्दन ॥ तत्रज्ञादद्विगतहानवर्गमहोदय ॥ १५ ॥

त्रिपञ्चलायापुरवर्तिन, पन् १०, प्रसति ।

read this huge Jaina Epic by Hemacandra he could not properly appreciate the poetic gifts of the great Ācārya. Dr. Bühler does not seem to have read carefully the *Chandanusāsana* of Hemacandra—a work on metres—otherwise he would not have said that the work does not contain verses in praise of Siddharāja (p. 36). The *Vṛatti* has verses both in praise of Kumārapāla as well as Siddharāja. Dr. Bühler's estimate of Hemacandra's grammar is also defective. He says—"The grammar does not, it is true, contain 125,000 *Slokas*, as Merutuṅga would have us believe. But including the commentaries and the appendices which, in their turn, have commentaries, it has something like 20,000 to 30,000 *Slokas*." (p. 18). There is enough evidence to support the opinion of Merutuṅga that the *Siddha-Hema* grammar consists of 125000 slokas. Hemacandra himself, wrote a *Brhannyāsa* resembling the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali. From older references we learn that this *Nyāsa* alone consisted of 80-8:000 verses. Unfortunately a great part of this *Nyāsa* appears to be lost. A few fragments of this *Nyāsa* are, however, found in old Jaina Bhandāras. These alone amount to about 20000 to 25000 verses. The *Sūtrapāṭha*, the *Laghupāṭha*, the *Brhappāṭha*, the *Dhātupāṭha*, the *Unāḍipāṭha*, the *Līṅgānusāsana* etc. of this grammar, which are mostly printed and published, consist of no less than fifty thousand slokas.

Dr. Bühler confuses the *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā* of Hemacandra with the *Syādvāda-mañjarī* which is in reality a commentary by Malliṣena on the *Anyayoga-vyavacchedadvātrīṅśikā*—a hymn of 32 verses—by Hemacandra. This *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā* is incomplete. There is reason to believe that this was probably his last work.

Thus one finds that Dr. Bühler's account of the life of Hemacandra requires to be revised and corrected at several places in the light of new material. I cannot give here all such revisions and corrections with relevant evidence, for the fear that it might double the bulk of the volume. Again it is in the fitness of things that I should leave this study which has become a classic on the subject as it is.

✽

✽

✽

My attention was first drawn to this learned study on the life of Hemacandra in the year 1915-16 when I was engaged in editing the *Kumārāpalapratibodha* of Somnprabhācārya, by my late lamented friend Mr. C. D. Dnal the originator and the first editor of the G.O.S. As I did not then know German I had to wait for two years before I got the substance of it at Poona through a German-knowing friend of mine. I was so impressed with its importance as a contribution on the subject that I thought of getting it translated into English and published in a handy form. Incidentally Mr. Motieand G. Kapadia of Bombay, who also came to learn of the importance of this work, expressed his desire to defray the expenses of the translation work. I entrusted the work to Miss. Kohn who is quite at home in both German and English. This translation

however, remained with Mr. Kapadia for a number of years without being published. I, however, desired that this valuable work should be made accessible to scholars who do not know German and who are interested in the subject. During my stay at Vis'va-bhārati Śāntiniketan, I talked to my friend Dr. Manibhai Patel, of my intention. He readily agreed to prepare an English rendering of this study and enthusiastically carried out the work. Thus after twenty years I had the satisfaction of making this work accessible to scholars in the English garb in the *Singh Jaina series*.

It is a matter of great pleasure to me that the learned and famous scholar Prof. M. Winternitz, the worthy Śiṣya of Dr. Buhler has contributed an excellent foreword to this English rendering of his *Gurū's* work. Our best thanks—of myself and of Babu Bahādursinghaji, the noble founder of this series—are due to him for this kindness.

BHARATI-NIVASA, }
AHMEDABAD }

JINA VIJAYA.

FOREWORD

Kalikālasarvajña, "The Omniscient of the Kali Age", was the title given to the great Jaina monk Hemacandra by his co-religionists, and he well deserved this title and his fame, on account of the astounding many-sidedness of his literary achievements. He was indeed one of the most versatile and prolific writers, both as a poet and as a scholar. It is due to him that Gujarat became a main stronghold of the Śvetāmbara Jains and has remained so for centuries, and that Jaina literature flourished there particularly in the 12th and 13th centuries. By his influence on the two Candakya kings Jayasimha Siddharāja, and Kumārapāla he was able to direct, in some measure, the destinies and the cultural progress of his native country. But not only Gujarat and the Jaina community owe a great debt of gratitude to Hemacandra, he has also a place of honour in general Sanskrit literature as a compiler of useful and important works on grammar, lexicography, poetics and metrics.

Among his poetical works his huge epic on the "Lives of the Sixty-three Excellent Men" (*Triṣaṣṭi-Salākāpuruṣa-Carita*) is perhaps best known. Though not without merit as a work of poetry, a Mahākāvya, as it is described by the author himself, yet its main purpose is instruction and edification. For us it is invaluable as a storehouse of ancient legendary lore and tradition. The appendix to this work, the *Parivṛtta-Parvan*, also called "Lives of the Series of Elders" (*Śhāvirāvali-Carita*) is even more important by its wealth of folklore and stories of all kinds. He has preserved to us many popular proverbs, and in one of his stories even folk-songs in dialect.

As a devout Jaina he also composed some hymns of praise (*Stotras*). His "Hymn to the Passionless (Mahāvīra)", the *Vitarāgastotra*, is at the same time a poetical manual of the Jaina religion.

Hemacandra is always more of a scholar and a moralist than a poet, though not without taste and considerable skill in the use of the Kāvya style. This is also shown by his didactic poem, the *Yogaśāstra*, consisting of a text in simple ślokas and a commentary in the style of ornate poetry, containing also stories.

As a poet, as a historian in some way, and as a grammarian, all at the same time, Hemacandra proved himself in the one epic poem *Kumārapāla-Carita*, also known as *Dvaidīpaya-Kāvya*, because it is written in two languages, Sanskrit and Prākṛit. The

poem describes the history of the Caulukyās of Anhilvād and more especially of Kumārapāla, the author's great patron, but at the same time it is intended to illustrate the rules of his own Sanskrit and Prakrit grammars

Hemacandra's grammar, called *Siddhahemacandra* or *Hamaryalarāṇa*, though hardly more than an improved edition of Śākatāyana's grammar, has yet been described by F. Kielhorn as "the best grammar of the Indian middle ages" on account of its practical arrangement and terminology. He also added himself a commentary and both *Unadiganaśūtra* and *Dhātupāṭha* to his grammar. Like other grammarians he also wrote a *Upaniṣadsāra*. The eighth chapter of his *Siddhahemacandra* is devoted to Prakrit grammar, which is still the most important grammar of the Prakrit dialects we possess. In his Prakrit grammar he has shown again his interest in popular poetry by preserving for us some pretty Apabhraṃśa songs which closely resemble the songs in Hāla's *Sattasaī*. In his manual of metres he even composed Apabhraṃśa songs himself in illustration of the Apabhraṃśa metres, and it seems to be due to Hemacandra, as Professor H. D. Velankar (*Annals Bhandarkar Inst.* 14, p. 15) has suggested, that Apabhraṃśa has become a literary language among Jaina Yatis.

Hemacandra's learned books, it is true, are not distinguished by any great originality, but they display a truly encyclopaedic erudition and an enormous amount of reading, besides a practical sense which makes them very useful. This applies also to his manuals of poetics and metres, the *Kavyanuśāsana* and the *Chandonuśāsana*, each accompanied by the author's own commentary.

Of the greatest importance for Sanskrit lexicography are the two works of Hemacandra on this subject, his synonymic lexicon *Abhidhanacintāmaṇimūla* with a commentary by the author himself, and his homonymic lexicon *Anelarthasamgraha*, with a commentary by the author's pupil Mahendrasūri. A supplement to the *Abhidhanacintāmaṇi* is the *Nighanṭusūtra*, a glossary of botanical terms in 396 śloka. Of inestimable value is his Prakrit lexicon *Desināmamūla*. All these lexicons are so very valuable, because Hemacandra was able to use sources which are lost to us, as also on account of their practical arrangement and the clear explanations.

Hemacandra's literary activity also extended to philosophy. He wrote a work on logic, the *Pramāṇa-Mīmāṃsā*, 'Examination of the Means of Proof,' again with his own commentary. And his *Anyayogaiyāraśchedadātṛimsika* 32 verses in praise of Mahāvīra and a treatise on logic at the same time, formed the basis for Mallisena's *Syādiadāmāñjarī*, which is not only a commentary on Hemacandra's treatise, but also an independent work on Jaina philosophy.

1 Until a short time ago it was believed that Hemacandra is also the author of a *Laṅkā-Arhamṇisūtra* a Jaina work on law and politics said to be a summary of a larger work in Prakrit, and published with a Gujarati commentary at Ahmedabad 1906. But Mr. C. R. Jain (see *The Jaina Gazette* January 1935 pp. 9ff.) assures us on the authority of Mr. Paran Chand Nahar, that this "Arhamṇi" is a spurious work of the 19th century. It is no loss to the fame of Hemacandra, if we have to omit this insignificant compilation from the list of his works.

It was my revered *Guru*, the late George Buhler, one of the pioneers of Jinistic studies, who first drew the attention of scholars to the works of Hemacandra and their importance for the history of Indian literature. His *Life of Hemacandra*, though written as far back as 1889, far from being antiquated, is still the most authentic work on the life of the great Jaina monk. More than that, Buhler's treatise cannot be too strongly recommended to every student of Indian history as a perfect model of historical research. No one has shown better than Buhler, how works of the Prabandha type, such as Prabhācandra's *Prabhāvakacaritra*, Merutuṅga's *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, and Rājaśekhara's *Prabandhakos'a*,² full of legends and worthless anecdotes as they are, may yet, by a careful critical investigation, be used as sources of history.

It was, therefore, a great pleasure to me, when Dr. Manilal Patel, Professor in the Vidyābhavana, Viśva-Bhārati, informed me that he had translated Buhler's classical essay into English, and that it was to form a volume in the excellent *Singhi Jaina Series* published by the Rev. Jinavijaya Muni, from Viśva-Bhārati, Śānti-niketan, and I am happy to be able to introduce this important work from the pen of my *Guru* in its new garb which will make it accessible to fellow-students who have hitherto been unable to read it in the original German.

M. WINTERITZ.

2 The *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* and the *Prabandhakos'a* have lately been published in excellent editions by Jinavijaya Muni, Sānti Professor of Jaina Culture at Viśva-Bhārati, Śānti-niketan, in the *Singhi Jaina Series*, where also an edition of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* is in preparation.

THE LIFE OF HEMACANDRA

CHAPTER I

The Sources

ALTHOUGH European Orientalists have, during the last 50 years, paid very close attention to the works of Hemacandra, there still remains the want of a thorough research in the life of this remarkable man who, through his extensive literary activity, made the name of the Śvetāmbaras universally known in the learned circles of India, and who, because of his influence over a mighty monarch of Gujarat during the second half of the 12th century, gained a predominant place for the Jaina doctrine for the time being in his own native land. Apart from the inadequate, and partly inaccurate, data in H. H. Wilson's works and in the prefaces to the editions of some of Hemacandra's works, the only detailed account of the life of this famous monk is found in K. Forbes' *Rās Malā*, (second edition, Bombay, 1878) pp. 145-157. A short article by Bhanu Daji in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. IX, p. 222f., is intended to supplement this account. Forbes' narrative is essentially a reproduction of the informations found in Merutunga's *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*. The anecdotes contained in this last-named work are put in a better chronological order, while the most striking improbabilities are set aside. At the end, some legends are appended which are taken from the oral tradition. This treatment of the material corresponds to the character of Forbes' work which makes no claim to give a critical adaptation of the history of Gujarat, but has as its title "A Garland of Historical Legends".

Since the year 1856, when the *Rās Mala* appeared, the systematic research carried on in the Jaina-Libraries in Western India has brought to light a large mass of new material for the life of Hemacandra. On the one hand, numerous works, such as *Prabhata-lacaritra*, *Prabandhalosa*, Commentaries on the *Ramandalastotra*, and a number of *Kumarapalacaritas* or *Kumararāgas* have been discovered which deal more or less in detail with the life of this 'spiritual head of the *Kaliyuga*' on the other hand, Hemacandra's own works, probably all of them and almost in complete form, are now accessible. It is therefore now possible to examine critically the information obtained through the secondary sources by comparing them with one another and with Hemacandra's own utterances—these are, alas! very rare—about his person and life-experiences. The character of these secondary sources, as well as the fact that the greater number of them were written long after Hemacandra's time and that they belong to the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries, renders it unnecessary to consider them collectively. A selection is quite sufficient, as the later authors for the most part only copy what their predecessors wrote.

For the following research I have used

1 The *Prabhata-lacaritra*, a collection of life-sketches of 22 Jaina *Ācāryas*, who bestowed glory on their faith, it was written about 1250, about 80 years after Hemacandra's death, by Prabhacandra and Pradyumnasuri.¹

2 The *Prabandhacintamani* by Merutungacarya of Vardhamānapura or Vadhavān in Kathiavād a collection of historical legends, completed on the full-moon day of the Vaisākha month, Vikrama Samvat 1362, that is, in April-May 1305 or 1306 A D.²

3 The *Prabandhalosa* by Rajasekhara a collection of the biographies of famous monks, poets and statesmen completed in Dhili or Delhi, Vikrama Samvat 1405, i.e. 1348-49 A D.³

4 The *Kumarapalacarita* by Jinamandana Upadhyaya, a life-story of the King Kumarpala of Gujarat V S 1199-1230, completed in Vikrama Samvat 1492, i.e. 1435-6 A D.⁴

The relationship of these works with one another is as follows. The *Prabhata-lacaritra* and the *Prabandhacintamani* represent two distinct—and apparently independent of each other—currents of tradition. They diverge very often and, as regards some parts, they do so in many important points, the older work gives us in some cases less trustworthy data. The author of the *Prabandhalosa* knows the *Prabandhacintamani* and regards his own account of Hemacandra as an appendix to the same. He says he will not repeat what is said in that work (*Prabandhacintamani*) he will, on the contrary, acquaint his readers with a number of unknown anecdotes.⁵ The material put forth by him is, it is true, generally not to be found in earlier works and appears to have been adapted from tradition to which he so often refers. Lastly, the *Kumarapalacarita* is a loose compilation from the three first-named and from several other similar works. Here and there, contradictory accounts of the *Prabhata-lacaritra* and of the *Prabandhacintamani*.

have been placed side by side; in other cases, attempts have been made to bring them in accord by alterations. These repetitions have, of course, no great worth, except when Jinamandana's method of broader representation is instrumental to a better understanding of the notes of his predecessors which were sometimes too brief. His extracts from some older and hardly accessible works are, on the other hand, of greater value,—particularly those from the *Moharājaparājaya*, a drama which Yaśaśpāla, a councillor or a minister of the 'Emperor' Ajayadeve, i. e. of the king Ajayapāla of Gujarat, wrote in honour of Kumārapāla's conversion to Jainism.* As Ajayapāla reigned immediately after Kumārapāla and sat on the throne only for three years, the informations given in the drama deserve serious attention as being those of a contemporary source.

Like all the *Caritras* and *Prabandhas*, even the oldest of the works enumerated are not purely historical sources; nor are they comparable to the European Chronicles of the Middle Ages or to those of the Arabs. On the whole they are sectarian writings and when using them, one must take into account not only the tendencies of the sect from which they emanate, but also other minor details and some peculiarities of the Indian character. According to the definition which Rājasekhara gives in his introduction to the *Prabandhakosa*,¹ the *Caritras* of the Jains are the biographies of the Tirthaṅkaras or Prophets—the ancient, whole-or half-mythical Emperors of India who are occasionally called *Calravartin*—and of the Seers, i. e. the great, ancient chiefs of the sects down to Ārya-Rakṣita who must have died in the year 557 after Vira or 30 A. D. According to him, the stories of men of later times, monks as well as laymen, are designated as 'Prabandha'. The motives with which the *Caritras* and the *Prabandhas* were written, are to edify the congregations, to convince them of the magnificence and the might of the Jaina faith and to supply the monks with the material for their sermons, or, when the subject is purely of worldly interest, to provide the public with pleasant entertainment. Metrical works of this class were written always according to the rules of the Brahmanical poetics, and were meant to exhibit the artistic skill and scholarship of the authors. As the authors start out with this point of view before them, they naturally make their works collections of interesting anecdotes serving their purpose rather than actual biographies or exact accounts of events in the past. They move almost always by leaps and bounds and often leave very important points entirely in darkness. At the same time, their information often betrays strong, intentional colouring in the interest of their own faith; whereas in other places poetic exaggerations or devices which are to make the story piquant, may easily be detected. Other circumstances which render it more difficult for us to ascertain the historical valuation of the *Caritras* and the *Prabandhas* are the uncertainty of their original sources which for the major part consist of the oral tradition of the schools of the monks or of the bards and of the fearful belief in miracles and superstitions which were perhaps more deep-rooted in the Indians than in the European peoples of the Middle Ages.

The authors of the *Prabandhas* admit most of the points referred to above, thereby themselves admitting their main weaknesses. Thus, Rājasekhara says in the Introduction to the *Prabandhakosa*, whilst at the same time giving interesting advice to the preachers of his faith:

"Here the pupil must humbly study everything, as prescribed, under a teacher

who has crossed the ocean of the holy scripture and eagerly fulfils his religious duties. Then for the salvation of the pious ones, he must deliver that sermon which stills the agony of sin, and the prescription for the same is this: the holy scripture must be read without committing any mistake, without contracting words, without omitting syllables. The explanation of the same should be given in a noble, sweet speech. Duly protecting one's body and looking round upon those who have gathered, one must speak so long as the matter is understood. *The speaker can generally attain his aim with the Caritras and the Prabandhas*."

Still greater details are given by Merutunga in the Introduction to the *Prabandhacintamani*, verses 5-7, as to the purpose of his work and the character of his sources:

5. 'The famous Gapiu Gunacandra has produced the first copy of the new work, the *Prabandhacintamani*, which is so lovely as the *Mahabharata*

6. 'The old tales do not delight the hearts of the shrewd so much, for they have heard the same very often. I am therefore compiling the book *Prabandhacintamani* with (the use of) biographies (of my time) of noble men who are nearer to us.'

7. 'Even if the tales which the wise tell according to their understanding necessarily become different in character, clever people should, however, not criticize this work maliciously, as it rests on a good tradition.'

Thus, Merutunga confesses that his chief purpose was to entertain his public and that there were several contradictory accounts in existence as to the persons and events described by him. He is quite conscious of the uncertainty of the foundation on which his building rests. His grounds of consolation are of very doubtful worth.

These confessions and the fact that besides obvious absurdities, a large number of anachronisms, omissions and other errors occur in all the parts of the *Prabandhas*, which can be controlled by the accounts of authentic sources make it essential for one to take the greatest precaution when using them. They should not, however, lead one to a complete rejection of the accounts contained therein, for the *Prabandhas* do contain much that is well corroborated by the inscriptions and other reliable sources. Particularly one must admit that the persons appearing in the older as well as later (*Prabandhas*) are all historical. However often a person is placed too early or too late or the most contrary certainty assumes that a particular man mentioned by him be a creation of the author's imagination. On the contrary, almost every new inscription, every collection of old manuscripts, and each newly discovered historical work supplies evidence for the actual existence of one or other of the personalities mentioned by them. So also those dates which they give as exact deserve always our most earnest consideration. Whenever these occur in other works of this class, which are usually independent of one another, we may without any hesitation accept them as historically correct. Naturally the same is also the case with other information. It will be seen from what follows that all the statements about Hemacandra in the *Prabandhakacaritra* as also in the *Prabandhacintamani* which are not from the outset doubtful because of their character, are completely correct. On

the whole, however, it must be admitted that even in the *Prabhāvakacarita* Hemacandra has become a semi-mythical personality. Considering the character of the *Prabandhas* described above, Hemacandra's own statements about his person and his time are naturally of the greatest significance. They are principally to be found:

1. In the Sanskrit *Dvyāś'rayamahākāya*, which gives a summary of the History of the Caulukya dynasty of Gujarat, from Mūlarāja down to Kumārapāla (Note 28);

2. In the Prakrit *Dvyāś'rayamahākāya* or *Kumāraś'carīya*, which celebrates his patron Kumārapāla (Note 88);

3. In the *Pras'asti* to his Grammar which is written in honour of his first patron Jayasīma Siddharāja and the ancestors of the same (Note 33);

4. In the *Mahāvīracarita* which belongs to the *Triṣaṣṭīś'alākāpuruṣacarita* (Note 66).

Besides, isolated facts are found scattered in almost all of his works. Without these authentic communications, a research into Hemacandra's life would yield results of little certainty. With the help of them, at least an outline of his biography can be drawn. There remain, however, significant gaps which cannot be filled up for the present.

who has crossed the ocean of the holy scripture and eagerly fulfils his religious duties. Then for the salvation of the pious ones, he must deliver that sermon which stills the agony of sin, and the prescription for the same is thus the holy scripture must be read without committing any mistake, without contracting words, without omitting syllables. The explanation of the same should be given in a noble, sweet speech. Duly protecting one's body and looking round upon those who have gathered, one must speak so long as the matter is understood. *The speaker can generally attain his aim with the Caritras and the Prabandhas*."

Still greater details are given by Merutunga in the Introduction to the *Prabandhacintamani*, verses 5-7, as to the purpose of his work and the character of his sources:

5 'The famous Gapin Guṇacandra has produced the first copy of the new work, the *Prabandhacintamani*, which is so lovely as the *Mahabharata*'

6 'The old tales do not delight the hearts of the shrewd so much, for they have heard the same very often, I am therefore compiling the book *Prabandhacintamani* with (the use of) biographies (of my time) of noble men who are nearer to us'

7. 'Even if the tales which the wise tell according to their understanding necessarily become different in character, clever people should, however, not criticize this work maliciously, as it rests on a good tradition'

Thus, Merutunga confesses that his chief purpose was to entertain his public and that there were several contradictory accounts in existence as to the persons and events described by him. He is quite conscious of the uncertainty of the foundation on which his building rests. His grounds of consolation are of very doubtful worth.

These confessions and the fact that besides obvious absurdities, a large number of anachronisms, omissions and other errors occur in all the parts of the *Prabandhas*, which can be controlled by the accounts of authentic sources, make it essential for one to take the greatest precaution when using them. They should not, however, lead one to a complete rejection of the accounts contained therein, for the *Prabandhas* do contain much that is well corroborated by the inscriptions and other reliable sources. Particularly one must admit that the persons appearing in the older as well as later (*Prabandhas*) are all historical. However often a person is placed too early or too late, or the most contrary certainty assume that a particular man mentioned by him be a creation of the author's imagination. On the contrary almost every new inscription, every collection of old manuscripts, and each newly discovered historical work supplies evidence for the actual existence of one or other of the personalities mentioned by them. So also those dates which they give as exact deserve always our most earnest consideration. Whenever these occur in other works of this class, which are usually independent of one another, we may without any hesitation accept them as historically correct. Naturally the same is also the case with other information. It will be seen from what follows that all the statements about Hemacandra in the *Prabhatacarita* as also in the *Prabandhacintamani* which are not from the outset doubtful because of their character, are completely correct. On

the whole, however, it must be admitted that even in the *Prabhāvakacaritra* Hemacandra has become a semi-mythical personality. Considering the character of the *Prabandhas* described above, Hemacandra's own statements about his person and his time are naturally of the greatest significance. They are principally to be found:

1. In the Sanskrit *Dvyāś'rayamahākāvya*, which gives a summary of the History of the Caulukya dynasty of Gujarat, from Mūlarāja down to Kumārapāla (Note 28);

2. In the Prakrit *Dvyāś'rayamahākāvya* or *Kumāravalcarīya*, which celebrates his patron Kumārapāla (Note 88);

3. In the *Pras'asti* to his Grammar which is written in honour of his first patron Jayasinha Siddharāja and the ancestors of the same (Note 83);

4. In the *Mahāvīracarita* which belongs to the *Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacaritra* (Note 66).

Besides, isolated facts are found scattered in almost all of his works. Without these authentic communications, a research into Hemacandra's life would yield results of little certainty. With the help of them, at least an outline of his biography can be drawn. There remain, however, significant gaps which cannot be filled up for the present.

CHAPTER II

Hemacandra's Youth

Hemacandra's birthplace was, according to all accounts, Dhandhakā, a town which was very important in former times and is even now not insignificant. It belongs to the district of Ahmedabad and lies just on the frontier between the main land of Gujarat and the peninsula of Kathiavad. There, in 1145 V S, he was born on the full moon night of the month of Karttika—that is, in November-December, 1088 or 1089 A. D.¹⁰ His parents, Cāciga and Pahini, belonged to the merchant (*Vaṇa*) caste, in particular to that sub-caste which is known as Srimodh Vamas¹¹ so called because this sub-caste originally came from Modherā. Both the parents adhered to the doctrine of Jina. Pahini distinguished herself through her special zeal for the faith and was moved by her piety to hand over her son whose worldly name was Cāṅgadeva or Cāṅgadeva,¹² to a monk named Devacandra as a pupil while still in his early childhood, and thus dedicated him to the spiritual order. The detailed circumstances which led Cāṅgadeva enter the order of the Yatis, are variously described and all the stories are more or less romantically adorned. The *Prabhāvalacaritra* gives only a short account. Pahini, so it says, once dreamed that she had presented the *Cintamani* (the stone that fulfils all wishes) to her spiritual adviser. She related her dream to the monk Devacandra who gave her an explanation that she would bear a son who “would resemble the Kaustubha-jewel of the ocean of the Jaina-doctrine.” When Cāṅgadeva was five years old, he accompanied his mother to the temple and sat on the seating-cushion of Devacandra while she was performing her worship. The monk reminded her of the dream and bade her entrust the boy to him as his pupil. Pahini referred him first to the child's father. As Devacandra kept silence over this, she fulfilled his wish, though unwillingly, “because she remembered the dream and because the word of the Teacher must not be disregarded.” Thereupon, Devacandra took the boy with him to Stambhatirtha, the present-day Cambay. There he was first consecrated in the temple of Paśvanatha on Saturday, the fourteenth day of the bright half of the month Māgha of the Vikrama-year 1150. On this occasion, the ‘famous’ Udayana held the usual festival. Cāṅgadeva received the name Somacandra.¹³

Merutuṅga is much more extensive. He differs in some not unessential points from the *Prabhāvakacaritra* and presents quite a complete little romance. According to him, Devacandra came to Dhandhukā on his journey from Pattana or Aṇhivād and went into the Temple connected with a monastery of Śrīmaddh merchants, in order to pay his homage to the image of Jina there. Cāṅgadeva, about eight years old, who roamed here and there playing with other companions of the same age, came there and sat down on Devacandra's resting-cushion which lay on the "throne" of the ordinary pulpit of the Jaina-monasteries. He thereby attracted the attention of the monk who on closer observation, found the boy to be endowed with signs of a high destiny. Wishing to get him as his pupil, the monk gathered together the congregation, i. e. the most esteemed Jaina merchants of the city, and went with them to the house of Cāciga. The father was absent from the house, but his wife Pāhīni received the monk and his companions in a fitting manner. Devacandra told her that the congregation had come there in order to beg from her, her son. Although moved to tears by the honour so done to her, Pāhīni at first declared herself unable to respond to the request, as her husband was of "heretical" mind and was, moreover, absent. At last the pressure of her relatives prevailed upon her and she handed the boy over to the Guru on their responsibility. Also Cāṅgadeva, who was consulted according to the rules, consented to become a pupil of the monk. Thereupon Devacandra immediately resumed his wandering with Cāṅgadeva and went to Karpāvati where he took the boy to the house of a royal minister, named Udayana. Without doubt he was afraid that his pupil might be taken back from him. He sought therefore to secure the shelter of an influential member of the Jaina congregation. Subsequent events showed that he was not in the wrong; for there soon appeared Cāciga who, after he returned from his journey, at once hurried to Karpāvati in order to take Cāṅgadeva back. The father had taken a vow not to take any food until he had seen his son. Having arrived there, he went to the dwelling place of the monk, so furious that he showed the latter scant reverence and would not be soothed. It was only when Udayana was approached and he intervened, that the father was reconciled. Udayana took him to his house, treated him with honour as an elder brother and entertained him hospitably. Then he sent for Cāṅgadeva, placed him in the lap of his father whom he offered a large sum of money besides other gifts of honour. Cāciga proudly declined the presents; but was so moved by the honour done to him by his host that he consented to let him have his son. On further persuasion by Udayana, he also allowed him to transfer his rights to Devacandra and finally performed the rite of world-renunciation for Cāṅgadeva.¹⁴

A third version which agrees neither with the *Prabhāvakacaritra* nor with Merutuṅga, is given by Rājasekhara. According to this, Devacandra often went to Dhandhukā on his journeys and preached there. One day, Nemināga, one of the believers among the gathering stood up and said that Cāṅgadeva, the son of his sister Pāhīni and of Thakkura Cāciga, had received spiritual awakening through the sermon and was begging to be ordained as a monk. Before his birth (he further said) his mother had seen in a dream a mango-tree which, when transplanted to another spot, had borne rich fruits. Thereupon Devacandra declared that the petitioner would, if he entered the spiritual order, perform great deeds: he was endowed with lucky marks and was worthy to be

ordained, but 'e consent of his parents must be obtained. When Cāṅgadeva's wish was put before his parents, they first of all opposed, but finally gave their consent to it."

Lastly, the author of the *Kumarapālacarita* gives both the first and the second stories with some embellishments and weaves them together in his own way, without troubling himself about the contradictions. Thus he declares thrice that Cāṅgadeva was born in the year 1145 of the Vikrama-era, but he twice gives us the date of his ordination the year 1150, i. e. the fifth year of his life, in agreement with the *Prabhāṭacaritra*, and once gives the date Vikrama Samvat 1151, i. e. the ninth year of his life, in accordance with Merutunga. According to his assumption, Cāṅgadeva received the name Somadeva after his ordination. He adds that the form Somacandra is used "by some."

Evidently the story of the *Kumarapālacarita* deserves no consideration. Also the account of Rājasekhara is not trustworthy, for he betrays his desire to prove that Hemacandra entered the holy order in strictest accordance with the doctrine of the sacred scriptures of the Jains. According to these doctrines, only he is worthy to become a monk who, enlightened through the sermon and through his own meditation, is convinced of the futility of the world and feels the intense longing for eternal salvation, the *Mukti*. In reality, the facts work somewhat differently. If the order of the Yatis were allowed to recruit members only from the volunteers who desired to renounce the world, then it would be in a bad position and the Jain-congregation would be short of preachers. The provision of the necessary recruits is generally secured by the rich members of the congregation buying up boys, still in their tenderest age, from their parents and entrusting them to the Yatis for instruction. Illegitimate children of Brahmin widows are given special preference as they can be cheaply bought and may be supposed to have spiritual aptitude, for often the fathers of such children belong to the most cultured castes of India. In this matter not seldom does it happen that children of poor Brahmins or Varnias are bought especially in times of high cost of living. In some isolated cases the Yatis themselves are active and make sure of successors by adopting forsaken orphans or by begging from their co-religionists children to whom they take fancy." These conditions of the present day clearly show that Rājasekhara's account is an invention especially because the contradictory statements of the *Prabhāṭacaritra* and of Merutunga agree with the first-named. It is for the same reason that one must declare as perfectly trustworthy the statement that Devacandra obtained Cāṅgadeva by begging him from his mother. It is in every way probable that a monk who was attracted by an intelligent boy, 'endowed with lucky marks', sought to get him as a pupil and gained his purpose by cleverly exploiting the piety and the weakness of the mother. The story of the dream and of its interpretation before the birth of the boy as found in the *Prabhāṭacaritra* is, of course, to be rejected as an outcome of the belief, so often repeated by the Jains, that the birth of great men is predicted to mothers by dreams.

In the same way, little value can be attached to the assertion in both the oldest sources, that Cāṅgadeva sat on the cushion of the monk. On the other hand, it is probably correct that Cāṅga opposed and attempted to bring his son back, as related by Merutunga. If he was, as Merutunga says, 'of heretical mind', that is, though belonging to the Jain congregation, he still adhered to the old views, then one can easily understand his opposition against his son's entering the Yati order. He was probably possessed by

the belief of the orthodox Indian who expects eternal happiness in heaven by the regular performance of sacrifices offered to the *manes* by his male successor and who, therefore, regards as the greatest ill-luck the untimely entrance of the latter into the holy order. Little as these viewpoints agree with Jainism, they are not seldom found among the Jaina laymen who, even though they do not perform sacrifices offered to the *manes*, still do share orthodox Indians' feelings for their male offspring. Similarly, there is no reason to doubt the statement that Udayana intervened between the monk and Cāciga. Udayana is certainly a historical personality. He was a Śrīmālī Vāṇī who emigrated into Gujarat from Śrīmāl or Bhīmāl in Mārvād. He is supposed to have settled down first of all in the city of Karnāvati, which took, according to K. Forbes, the place of modern Ahmedabad. Soon afterwards, he was appointed Mantrin or royal counsel in Stamhha-tirtha by Siddharāja-Jayasinha and probably occupied the post of a Civil Governor in that city.¹⁸ He is referred to repeatedly in Hemacandra's biography. Also the short remark in the *Prabhāvakacaritra* that the famous Udayana had performed the ceremony of Cāṅgadeva's ordination in Cambay, points to the fact that Merutuṅga was correct in representing Udayana as Devacandra's patron. If this is so, then we have also a solution of the contradictions in both the oldest sources regarding Cāṅgadeva's age at the time of his ordination and regarding the city where it took place. As regards the first point, Merutuṅga, and as regards the second point, the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, is in the right. For, it is in itself improbable that Cāṅgadeva was ordained to become a monk in his fifth year, in V. S. 1150. This becomes quite unbelievable when we are told that Udayana at that time was already a royal counsel or was living in Cambay, because the King Jayasinha, in whose reign he emigrated into Gujarat, ascended the throne only in the Vikrama year 1150. Consequently Merutuṅga's date for the ordination,—the eighth or ninth year of his life, according to Jinamandana, the Vikrama year 1154—has decidedly an advantage. On the other hand, the place where the ceremony was performed, must be Cambay and not Karnāvati. In addition, it may be adduced that the *Prabhāvakacaritra* further remarks that Kumārapāla, after his conversion had a *Dikṣāvihāra*, i. e. a temple with a monastery, built in Cambay, in memory of Hemacandra's ordination. Merutuṅga agrees with this fact, despite his earlier contradictory statement.¹⁹

The sources supply us with little information regarding the next twelve years of the life of Hemacandra, or more properly Somacandra, which he spent as a student and servant of his Guru. Definite statements are to be found only in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*. There it is stated that he studied Logic and Dialectics as well as Grammar and Poetics and that he mastered these subjects at once on account of the power of his intelligence "which shone clear and pure as light". It is of course in itself clear that Somacandra learnt these branches of Brahmanical lore only as a supplement to the theology of the Jains. For, his training as a teacher and preacher of the Jaina-faith necessitated, naturally, above all, intimate knowledge of the Prakrit-dialect in which the Jaina-sūtras are written, as also a thorough study of the latter, of their commentaries and of other scriptures related thereto. His later scholarly attainments show that the statement of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* as to his capacities is right and that he must indeed have possessed more than ordinary power of intellect. There is no mention as to whether Devacandra alone instructed him or whether he had other teachers as well. The first assumption is,

however, not improbable, as Devacandra appears to have been a man of no insignificance. Devacandra is of course not mentioned in the lists of teachers. On the other hand, Rājasekhara assumes that he belonged to the Pūrṇacandra Gaccha and to the line of Yaśobhadra, the Rāṇa of Vatapadra who was converted by Dattasūri, and that Yaśobhadra's pupil was Pradyumnasūri, the author of many works and his pupil Guṇasena was Devacandra's teacher. He adds, moreover, that Devacandra wrote a commentary to Thāna, i.e. the Sthānāṅga, as also a life of Śāntinātha. The latter statements may be correct. For, Devasūri mentions in the Introduction to his *Śāntināthacaritra* that it is translated from the great homonymous Prakrit-poem of Devacandra, the teacher of Hemacandra. Rājasekhara's account of Devacandra's school and teacher appears, on the other hand, to be partly incorrect. It is true that Jinamāṇḍana says exactly the same that Dattasūri of the Kotikagana, the Vajra Śākha and of the Candra Gaccha, had converted the Rāṇa Yaśobhadra and he gives the same line of teachers: Pradyumnasūri, Guṇasena, Devacandra. But the *Prabhavakacaritra* (See Note 13, verse 14) calls the latter a pupil of Pradyumnasūri and Hemacandra himself says in the *Mahāvīracarita* that he belonged to the Vajrasākha and to the line of Municeandra.²⁰ In none of his works, known so far, does Hemacandra give the name of his teacher, although ample opportunity should have been offered for the same. It almost appears as if his later relationship with his teacher might not have been of friendly nature. In this respect, an anecdote given by Merutunga could be cited. Devacandra refused to teach his pupil the art of making gold because he had already 'ill digested' other easier sciences and hence was neither worthy nor capable of learning so difficult an art.²¹ Whatever be the solution of these difficulties, this much is certain that Devacandra was a learned man who had the qualification to train a pupil like Hemacandra.

In the last years of Somacandra's apprenticeship, the *Prabhavakacaritra* ascribes a journey, or rather the plan for a journey, by which the young monk wanted to win the favour of the goddess Brahmī, the patroness of learning, in order to overcome all rivals by her grace. With the permission of his teacher he set out on a tour towards the land of Brahmi via Tāmalapṭi in company of other Sadhus well versed in the *Sāstras*. He went, however, only upto Raivatīvatara, the sanctuary of Neminātha, where he devoted himself to ascetic practices in Madhmadata Sartha (?). During the practices, the goddess of speech appeared before him and informed him that he would attain his desire at home. He therefore cancelled his further programme and returned to his teacher.²² Although in India it be not unusual that a scholar or a poet seeks to attain the *Sarasvatī mantra*, a magic formula, which gives him mastery over speech and although Hemacandra himself admits unreservedly of his faith in such means in his manual of Poetics, the *Alamkaracīdamani*,²³ yet one must interpret the above story only as an explicative myth. Indeed, the extra-ordinarily naive geographic conceptions of the author point to this. When he says that Somacandra wanted to travel via Tāmalapṭi or Tamluk in Bengal in order to reach Brāhmadeśa, i.e. Kāśmīr, it is clear that he is confounding the Brāhmadeśa with the Brahmadeśa or Burma. Still more absurd is it that Somacandra is supposed to have gone on his journey first to Raivatīvatāra i.e. Janagadh in Kāthiavād. Later on, Jinamāṇḍana detected this absurdity and tried to make the story more credible by an alteration (See Note 22).

According to all the sources, Somacandra's term of apprenticeship came to a close in Vikrama Samvat 1166 as he was then ordained as a Sūri or Ācārya, i. e. an independent exponent of the holy scriptures and a successor of his teacher. On this occasion he again changed his name according to the custom of Jaina-ascetics, and was now called Hemacandra. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* suggests that Devacandra was an old man by this time and soon afterwards took to those chastisements which lead the conscientious Jaina to Nirvāna. Except in the above-mentioned story of Merutunga, he is no more referred to in the *Prabandhas*. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* adds further that Pāhini, when her son received the second ordination, took "cāritra", that is to say, she entered the Jaina nunnery. According to a further statement of Merutunga's, she lived for a considerable time after this and died just about V. S. 1211.

CHAPTER III

Hemacandra and Jayasimha-Siddharāja

The sources speak nothing about Hemacandra's life during the time which immediately followed his ordination as a Sūri. They jump over a long series of years and resume only with his migration to Anahilapātaka or Pattana, the modern Anahilvād-Pāṭan, the Capital of Gujarat, where he lived, as the *Prabandhas* expressly and apologetically state, the great part of his life. There, by royal favour, an honorable career as author and promoter of his faith lay open to the Sūri. His first patron was the Caulukya king Jayasimha, designated Siddharāja, who had ascended the throne in the year 1150 of the Vikrama era and who ruled over Gujarat and the adjoining provinces of the western India until the Vikrama year 1199. According to all documents, Jayasimha was one of the most energetic and ambitious kings of the Caulukya-dynasty. He extended his kingdom as well towards the east as towards the west. Amongst his successful, warlike undertakings, a special mention is frequently made in the *Prabandhas*, as well as in inscriptions, of his conquest of Surāṣṭrā or Sorāṣṭh in the south of Kāṭbhāvād and of the occupation of Ujjain, which resulted in the arrest of the king Yaśovarman and the annexation, at least for the time being, of the western Mālvā. He is equally famous for his public buildings and the construction of huge lakes in Pāṭan, Siddhapur, Kapadvanj, Viramgām and other cities. These lakes are still partly preserved. According to the *Prabandhas*, he was a friend of *belles-lettres* and entertained an earnest desire of seeing his achievements immortalised by a great poet. He therefore patronised the bards and poets and kept a poet laureate, Kaviśvara Śrīpāla who, though an author of various poetic works, does not seem to have been really able to tackle satisfactorily the task entrusted to him by his patron. The same sources speak also about Jayasimha's pursuit of philosophy. Although he was a Śivāite like his forefathers and, according to some stories, rigidly maintained the privileges of the Brahmanical faith, it is however reported that he, being eager to obtain complete deliverance from the fetters of rebirth, summoned from all countries teachers of various sects whom he questioned on Truth and God and the Holy Law, and had them discuss these points in his presence. Hemacandra confirms these statements in the *Prasasti* to his Grammar (Note 33, verse 18, 22), where he speaks of Jayasimha's ascetic propensities, and in the *Dvāyārayakārya*, in which mention is made of the establishment of schools where Dialectics, Astronomy and the Purāṇas were taught (see Note 28).

It is easily comprehensible that even a Jaina monk who had a thorough knowledge of Sanskrit-literature and the Brahmanical sciences as well as proficiency in the poetic art, could win the favour of a king of this kind. The sources are not, however, at one as to the art and manner in which Hemacandra came to be introduced to Jayasimha. According to the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, by an accidental meeting he became acquainted with the king and by a clever exploitation of the opportunity thus offered, he got entry into the palace. Once, as it is said, Siddharāja passed through the streets of his capital riding on an elephant and saw Hemacandra standing by a shop near a slope. The king stopped his elephant just by the mound (*śimlala*) and called out to the monk: "Recite something!" Hemacandra at once replied with a stanza composed on the spur of the moment; "Siddha, let the stately elephant jump freely without any hesitation! May the world-protecting elephants tremble! What's the good of all of them? By thee alone is the world guarded!" Jayasimha was pleased with this stanza so much that he invited the author to go to the palace daily at noon and to entertain him. Hemacandra accepted the invitation and gradually won the king's friendship. Jinamaṇḍana agrees with this story in the main. It appears, however, that he drew his material from some other source. For, the verse which he attributes to Hemacandra, has a different form and he attempts to ascribe the reason of the king's addressing Hemacandra to the astonishing appearance of the latter and to the king's amazement at the same." Merutuṅga mentions nothing of this meeting and its results. According to his report, Hemacandra became known to Jayasimha much later, just when he was returning from the victorious expedition against Mālvā. On this occasion Jayasimha held, on entering the capital, a ceremonious procession in which Yaśovarman, the captive king of Mālvā, and the rich spoils gathered in the war were triumphantly exhibited. The heads of various fellowships of faiths appeared among the deputies from Anhlivāḍ, in accordance with the Indian custom, to shower their benedictions on the victorious king. Among the group of the Jains was also Hemacandra who had been selected as a spokesman on account of his great learning. He paid homage to the king with these words: "Wish-fulfilling cow, besprinkle the earth with thy fluid! Ye, Oceans, scatter the *svastika*-figures of pearls! Moon, become thou a full bowl! Ye elephants-protectors of quarters of the globe, bring boughs of the heavenly tree, and unplat victory-garlands from them with your long trunks! For, does not the king Siddha, who has conquered the earth, come now?" This stanza that was "adorned with a commentary", was praised by the king and brought its author great honour".

The *Prabhāvakacaritra* (see Note 24) and Jinamaṇḍana similarly know this story. They however surmise that Hemacandra only renewed his acquaintance with the king on his return from Mālvā and that he received a new invitation to the palace.

As regards the credibility of these statements, the second of them must certainly be historical. The stanza with which Hemacandra is supposed to have greeted the king, is authentic. For, it is found at the end of the twenty-fourth *Pāda* of Hemacandra's Grammar which, as will be later on shown, contains thirty-five verses composed by the author in honour of the Candukya kings. The last words, "For, does not the king Siddha, who has conquered the earth, come now?", produce a good sense only if one takes that the *śloka* was composed, as the *Prabandhas* maintain, originally as an occasional poem in honour of a triumphal procession and later inserted into the Grammar. As regards the

story of the meeting in the hazar, it is not possible to be equally certain. In itself the story sounds a bold one. It is not improbable that an Indian prince, who took an interest in the art of poesy, should address a man whose outward appearance struck him, and should, as a reward for a graceful compliment, grant him access to the customary audiences of scholars and poets. It is however hard to comprehend how Jayasimha could presuppose a proficiency in poetry in a Juna monk who was unknown to him. The matter is made more suspicious by the fact that the stanza, which Hemacandra is supposed to have composed on this occasion, should be given in two different versions and that none of them should exist in the authentic works of Hemacandra. Finally, it is noteworthy that the *Prabhavakacaritra* should have nothing to report particularly about Hemacandra's intercourse with Jayasimha during the period between the first and the second meeting. Only Jinmandana relates a number of anecdotes regarding this intercourse. Even these anecdotes, according to other sources³⁸, fall into a later time. Under such circumstances the credibility of the first story is doubtful. In spite of this, there are some reasons which make it probable that Hemacandra was introduced to the court of Jayasimha before the conquest of Malva. The expedition against Malva, the date of which is not, with exactitude, given in any of the sources, must have taken place after the Vikrama year 1192, as, it is known, in the month of Magha of that year Prince Yaśovarman who was conquered and taken prisoner by Jayasimha, made a grant of land, which proves that he still occupied the throne.³⁹ Probably this expedition was undertaken soon after this date. For, Jayasimha himself died in the Vikrama year 1199, and it is evident from his biography in Hemacandra's *Dnyuśrayakavya* that he reigned for many years after his return from Malva. Now if Hemacandra became first acquainted with Jayasimha at the time of the latter's imposing triumphal entry, then it could not have happened before the Vikrama Samvat 1194 in which case he could have had influence at the court of the king for about five years only. But that this influence lasted much longer than five years is clear from Merutunga's account of the famous debate held by the Śvetāmbara Devāsuri and the Digāmbara Kumudeśandra in the presence of Jayasimha. He describes⁴⁰ that, on this occasion the 'young' (विपुलविराट्) Hemacandra was present as a supporter of Devāsuri and that he succeeded in winning the favour of the king as a supporter of for his side. The *Prabhavakacaritra*, XXI, 195 gives as the exact date of the debate the full-moon day of the month Vaiśākha, Vikrama Samvat 1181,⁴¹ while Merutunga allows the same to take place towards the end of Jayasimha's reign after the expedition against Malva. There can be no doubt that the statement of the *Prabhavakacaritra* deserves preference and that Merutunga took the liberty of a fanciful shifting of the date. The last-named fact is especially proved by the remark that Hemacandra was a young man at that time. Had the debate taken place towards the end of the nineteenth year, then Hemacandra should have been over fifty years of age. Under these circumstances, it cannot be denied that, even according to the sources which Merutunga used, the first acquaintance of Hemacandra with Jayasimha took place before the time of the war with Malva. This does not, however, prove that the story of the *Prabhavakacaritra*, about the first meeting of the both, tells the truth. Its internal improbability remains just as great as before. The story might well have been invented as a historical setting to the famous verses of Hemacandra addressed to the king after the real facts leading to the former's introduction into the court of his lord had been forgotten. The facts may be sought in

Jayasimha's endeavours to learn the tenets of various sects. Possibly Hemacandra might have also been helped by his connection with Udeyana who had great influence. It will also be later on seen that even Udayana's sons stood in very intimate relationship to Hemacandra. This help was quite natural and to be expected because Udayana had taken the boy Cāṅgadeva under his care. Hemacandra's former acquaintance with Jayasimha was probably not very intimate, for, the oldest source, as we have already noted, has nothing to say about it, while the stories of Jinameṇḍana deserve no credence.

On the other hand, by reason of his benedictions at the king's procession, Hemacandra appears to have won a lasting influence. He became, first of all, Court-Pandit and then Court-Annalist. In the first position, he was entrusted by Jayasimha with the preparation of a new grammar. In the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, further circumstances which induced the king to take this step, have been described as follows. Sometime after his triumphal entrance into the city, the manuscripts captured in Ujjain were exhibited to Jayasimha himself and the scholars of his court. He was attracted by one treatise on grammar that was among them. He questioned what that work was and in reply he was told that it was a work on etymology, compiled by the Paramāra king Bhoja; and the extensive literary activity of that poly-historian who had written works on all branches of learning, was highly praised. The praise kindled Jayasimha's jealousy and he expressed his regret that his treasury had no such series of manuals written in his kingdom. Thereupon all the scholars assembled there turned their faces towards Hemacandra, suggesting thereby that they considered him worthy of becoming the Bhoja of Gujarat. The king espoused their opinion and requested Hemacandra to prepare a new grammar, as the then available grammars, being too short or too difficult and antiquated, did not serve their purpose. Hemacandra expressed his willingness to accede to his lord's wish; he begged however for his help in securing the necessary materials, such as the eight older grammars which were to be found in their entirety only in the library of the Temple of Sarasvatī in Kashmir. Jayasimha at once sent high officials to Pravarapura to fetch the MSS. The officials put up in the temple of the deity and laid their petition. Pleased with their songs of praise, there appeared Sarasvatī to them and ordered the librarian to send the desired works to her favourite Hemacandra. Her command was carried out and the scholar Utsāha returned to Anhilvād with the books. The ambassadors, on their return, described to the king how highly his *protégé* stood in favour of the goddess. The king considered his land fortunate in having such a man. Hemacandra looked through the MSS. brought to him and compiled his grammar in eight Adhyāyas and thirty-two Pādas; and in homage to the king he entitled it *Siddhahemacandra*, "compiled by Hemacandra and dedicated to Siddharāja". As the custom required, the work consisted of five parts, the Aphorisms, the Indexes of the Words formed with *unādi* suffixes, a Root-Lexicon, a Treatise on the Rules of Gender, and a Running Commentary. Hemacandra furthermore added two more lexica, the *Nāmanālā* and the *Anekārthakoṣa*. In order to characterise the Grammar as a court-work, the author adorned it with a *prastāvi*, a poem of praise, in 35 stanzas in honour of the Caulukya dynasty from Mīlarāja down to Jayasimha. One stanza at the end of every *pāda* and four stanzas at the end of the whole work were given. On its completion, the grammar was read before the court and was accepted by the scholars as a model work because of its clarity and precision. The king then summoned

three hundred copyists to Anhluvād, who had to make copies during three years. Then he presented one copy to each of the heads of all the sects in his kingdom and dispatched other copies all over India, nay, even beyond the borders of India, into Persia, Ceylon and Nepal. Twenty copies were also sent to Kāśmīr which the goddess Sarasvatī accepted for the library of her Temple. In order to further still more the study of this work, Kāyastha Kikala, a well-known grammarian, was invited to teach it in Anhluvād. Every month a public examination of his pupils was held on the Jñānapāṣaṁī. Whoever did his task well, received from the king a shawl, a golden ornament, a sedan-chair or a sunshade.

Merutunga's account which Jinarāyana copies almost verbatim is much shorter and runs quite differently. When the king praised Hemacandra's stanza composed in honour of his triumphal entrance, it is said in the *Prabandhaśāntamāṇa*, "some jealous Brahmins remarked 'The monk has drawn his wisdom purely from our books!' The king thereupon asked Hemacandra if it was so. The latter replied "We study the Jaina-grammar which Mahāvīra in his childhood explained to Indra. The envious Brahmins rejoined that it was a story of hoary antiquity and that Hemacandra might name a more modern grammarian of his faith. Then the monk offered himself to write a new grammar in a few days if only His Highness Siddharaja helped him. The king consented and dismissed the scholars. After the celebrations of the triumphal entrance were over, the king was reminded of the story of the grammar and he ordered to collect, as promised, MSS of all the existing grammars from many lands and also summoned scholars who were conversant with various systems. Hemacandra then wrote in one year the *Siddhahemacandra* in five parts which contained 125 000 couplets each of 32 syllables. When the book was ready, it was brought to the palace in right royal honour on the state-elephant and was deposited there in the treasury. From that time onwards, all other grammars were ignored and the *Siddhahemacandra* alone was studied everywhere. This disappointed the rivals of Hemacandra and one of them secretly sneaked to the king that the grammar did not contain, as it should have contained, a poem of praise in honour of the Caulukya dynasty. Hemacandra got scent of that scandal and learned that the king was angry with him for that oversight. Thereupon he composed at once thirty-two stanzas in honour of the Caulukyas and recited them the next morning when his grammar was being read in the palace. The king was thereby reconciled and ordered that the knowledge of the Grammar be further spread.

It can be seen at the first glance that neither of the two stories possesses a claim to credibility in all its details. As Hemacandra's grammar is, however, preserved in its completeness and as recently many later works bearing on the same have become known, it is possible to examine critically the statements of tradition and to note that a great part of them, especially of those in the *Prabandhaśāntamāṇa*, is quite correct. To this category belong, first of all, the date of the last-named work as to the extent, the arrangement and character of the Grammar, as well as the cause that led to its compilation. The *Siddhahemacandra* contains, it is true, eight *Adhyayas* and thirty-two *Padas* and at the end of the commentary on each *Paḍa* comes one stanza in honour of one of the first seven Caulukya kings while at the end of the whole there are four stanzas. "The *Siddha-*

hemacandra is said to be a work in five parts also in MSS.; and there are, besides the Sūtras, still separate sections about the *unādi*-suffixes, the *gaṇas*, the roots and the gender of nouns. Besides this, the author has provided all the parts of his book with a commentary in two recensions,²² whose compilation falls, as some allusions to the victory of Jayasīṃha, and the *Prasasti* show, in the time of the reign of Siddharāja. Moreover, it is not only dedicated, as the title indicates, to the king Jayasīṃha-Siddharāja, but it also owes its origin to the request or command of the king. Quite similarly to the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, it is said in the *Prasasti*, stanza 35, that Siddharāja being dissatisfied with the older grammars, requested the monk Hemacandra to write a new one and that the monk thereupon wrote it "according to the rules". Of the further statement of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* that the inspection of the MSS., secured in Mālvā, was the immediate cause of the king's command, there is in fact no corroboration in other works. And yet this statement, considered on its own merits, is by no means improbable. For, when Jayasīṃha cherished the anxious desire, as already mentioned, to immortalise the memory of his reign through literary works, it was then only natural that the perusal of Bhoja's works aroused his jealousy and induced him to call upon the best scholar in his empire to write similar works. The *Siddhahemacandra* is then a compilation from earlier grammars as opined by the tradition. It is based specially on the grammar of Śāktāyana and on the *Kātantra*, as Kielhorn has shown. In his commentary on the work, Hemacandra cites very often the views of "others", of "certain persons", et cetera; and with the help of glossaries—unfortunately incomplete ones—to the Commentary, Kielhorn has discovered that for the first five *Padas*, not less than 15 different grammatical works had been used.²³ For the whole work, the number is no doubt appreciably greater. From this, it appears quite credible that Hemacandra had collected materials from various places before he began his work, as also that his patron had been helpful in his task. Even at present the Indian princes provide their court-pandits almost regularly with MSS. and often manage to get them from afar at great cost. When, however, the *Prabhāvakacaritra* opines on this point that all the MSS. came from the library of the temple of Sarasvati in Kāśmīr, it must be an exaggeration, originating in the author's too high regard for the literary greatness of the land of Śāradā. Merutuṅga's statement that the king managed to gather grammars from various lands, is more probable. Finally, one cannot declare as untrustworthy the statement made in both the sources that Jayasīṃha accelerated the circulation of the new *Vyākaraṇa*, distributed the copies of the same and appointed a teacher in order to teach it to others. If the pains taken by the king Ānandapāla with a view to circulating the *Sisyaśikṣā* written by his teacher Ugrabhūti, as described by Berrāl, are without doubt historical,²⁴ then similar statements about the works written at the command of the princes deserve full consideration. In the case of the *Siddhahemacandra*, it is to be further added that the grammarian Kakkala—as the exponent of this grammar is called in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*—is not only a historical personality, but really did make himself useful in expounding the work. One opinion of Kakkala is mentioned in the *Nyāsa* on the commentary of Hemacandra, used by Kielhorn. Moreover, Guṇacandra, a pupil of Devasūri, praises a great dialectician, poet and grammarian, by name Kakkala who was a sort of a professor, and says that it was at the command of Kakkala that he wrote the *Tattvapraśāṅkā* or *Haimavibhrama*—an essay to interpret the *Siddhahemacandra*.²⁵ Kakkala, Kakkala and Kakkalla are the three Prakrit-forms produced partly through

difference of accentuation and all of them are diminutives of the Sanskrit name *Karka*. They designate without doubt one and the same personality. Devasuri, the spiritual teacher of Guṇacandra is probably the famous Jaina-bishop, already mentioned, who in V S 1181 held a debate with Kumudacandra and died in V S 1226. If one agrees to this, then the statements of Guṇacandra seem to confirm those in the *Prabhāvalacaritra*. On another point, namely, the mention of the period at which Hemacandra completed his work, the statements of the *Prabandhas* are to be rectified. The *Prabhāvalacaritra* does not, it is true, say anything in detail about this but suggests that the Grammar was composed within a short space of time. Merutunga, on the other hand, opines boldly that it was written in one single year. This is simply an impossibility and, moreover is contradicted by a remark in stanza 23 of the *Prasasti*. There Hemacandra mentions that Jayasimha has celebrated a festival of pilgrimage (यात्रा इव) 1. The *Dryas rayakavya* speaks only of a single pilgrimage of the king to Devapattana and Girnār which seems to have taken place in the last year of his rule (See Note 28). The *Prasasti* must, therefore, have been written after this pilgrimage and, as it must only have been written after the completion of the Grammar, the latter (the Grammar) also should have been finished after this time. Between the return from Malvā and the end of the pilgrimage, two or three years might have passed according to the statements of the *Dryas rayakavya*. As the former falls, according to the above arguments, in the Vikrama year 1194, then the Grammar must have been ready, at the earliest, towards the end of the Vikrama-year 1197.

The success of his Grammar appears to have induced Hemacandra to extend further the scope of his work and to write a number of handbooks which should give the students of Sanskrit composition—and more particularly of the poetics complete guidance to correct and eloquent expression. This endeavour led to the compilation of a number of Sanskrit-lexica and textbooks of rhetoric and metrics as well as of a formal artistic poem meant for illustrating the grammatical rules. This poem is *Dryas rayamahākavya* which contains the history of the Cālukya princes. The series of these works opened with a homonymic lexicon, the *Abhidhanacintamani* or *Numamala* by name. Then followed the synonymic lexicon the *Anekarthasamgraha* thereafter the manual of poetics the *Alamkaracandamani* and lastly the *Chandonuśāsana* the Metrics. This order is chiefly fixed by the statements given in the above-named works.²² With reference to the first two the *Prabhāvalacaritra* (Note 31, verse 98) says that they were completed simultaneously with the Grammar. There is little possibility in this as the composition of the Grammar, its appendices and commentaries would have been quite sufficient work for that short period, even if Hemacandra, as is very usual in India, took the help of his pupils while compiling the commentaries and even if he had made preparations for his work earlier. The Grammar does not, it is true, contain 125 000 *ślokas*, as Merutunga would have us believe. But including the commentaries and the appendices which, in their turn, have commentaries it has something like 20 000 to 30 000 *ślokas*. It might, however, be right that both of the *Kosas* were completed before Jayasimha's death. That none of them contains a dedication or other usual characteristic to prove that the work was written at the king's command, is no obstacle here. Hemacandra seems to have

regarded them, as is also suggested by their not being mentioned in the *Alamkāracūḍāmaṇi* (see Note 38), as supplements to the Grammar, and on this account he might have considered any mention of his patron as superfluous. According to a short note³⁹ which Merutuṅga gives at the end of the story of the Grammar, the *Dvyāśrayamahākāvya* also belongs to this period. It is said to have been written immediately after the Grammar, in order to celebrate Siddharāja's conquest of the world. This cannot, however, be absolutely correct. For, the last five cantos of the poem, *Sargas XVI-XX*, describe a great part of the career of the king Kumārapāla who was Jayasimha's successor. The end indicates that Kumārapāla was still living and stood at the zenith of his power. In its form, as extant, it cannot have been completed before V. S. 1220. Now because Hemacandra had also undertaken to revise one other work towards the end of his life, as will be later on shown, it is quite possible that the *Dvyāśrayamahākāvya* was undertaken at the wish of Jayasimha and perhaps was finished upto the narration of the deeds of the king, that is, upto the fourteenth *Sarga*. In support of this, one can also add that the author of the *Ratnamālā* says,⁴⁰ Jayasimha had the annals of his dynasty prepared under his order, and that nothing is known about any other comprehensive chronicle of the Caulukyās excepting Hemacandra's work. While there is still some probability of the two *loṣas* and the *Kāvya* having been written wholly or partly during the period of Jayasimha's reign, the same is not the case about the *Alamkāracūḍāmaṇi* and the *Chandonuśāsana*. These were probably written in the beginning of the rule of Kumārapāla. The reasons for this hypothesis are given below.

Many more anecdotes are described in the *Prabandhas* about Jayasimha's intercourse with Hemacandra after the compilation of the Grammar. The greater number of them deserves no serious attention because of their very character and those few which, at first, appear as if they were historical, prove to be, on closer scrutiny, of doubtful worth. The first story which the *Prabhāvalacaritra* describes, tells us that Rāmacandra, a prominent pupil of Hemacandra's, lost his right eye, because Jayasimha—to whom he had been introduced by his teacher—exhorted him to have only *one eye* on the Jaina doctrine (*ekadṛṣṭir bhavaṇ*). Merutuṅga, on the other hand, has another explanation for the probably historical fact that Rāmacandra was a one-eyed man. According to his statement, this defect was the result of an ill-considered stricture which Rāmacandra, despite the warning of his teacher, passed on Śrīpāla's praise-poem on the Sahasraliṅga lake.⁴¹ The second story of the *Prabhāvalacaritra* describes how cleverly Hemacandra contrived to help himself out of adverse situations, and to silence the envious Brahmins. Once, so runs the story, a Brahmin who had listened to the exposition of Nemīcarita in the Caturmukha temple of the Jains, complained to Jayasimha that the heretics themselves did not even respect the venerable traditions of the *Mahābhārata*, and that they asserted the conversion of the Pāṇḍava to Jainism. He added the request thereto that the king might check such a travesty of truth. However, before pronouncing any opinion on the matter, Jayasimha wanted to hear what the other party had to say and sent for Hemacandra as he was, in Jayasimha's opinion, the most learned and truth-loving Jaina. On being questioned whether the complaints of the Brahmin had in them any truth or not, Hemacandra admitted that the sacred scriptures of the Jains did contain

the said doctrine. But he advanced an excuse for the same by saying that it referred to a verse in the *Mahābhārata* where mention was made of hundred Bhīṣmas, three hundred Pāṇḍavas, thousand Droṇas and numberless Kārnas. Then he added that it might be quite possible that some of these many Pāṇḍavas were converted to the Jaina faith. Moreover, their statues could be seen in Śātruṅḡaya, Nāsi and Kedaṛa. As the Brahmin did not know how to reply to such an argument, the king refused to take any proceedings against the Jainas.⁴

The three other *Prabandhas* make no mention of this story. The same, however, appears in another version in the *Kathāloka*. On the other hand, we find in Merutunga, in a somewhat divergent form, a repetition of the third story of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* about the ennobling of the Purohita Āmiga by Hemacandra. Āmiga censured that the Jaina ascetics received women into their monasteries and that they enjoyed too good meals. Such practices, he thought, easily led to violations of the vow of chastity. Thereupon Hemacandra silenced him with a simile that the moderation of the flesh-eating lion stands opposite to the erotic tendencies of the dove that lives on only feeble grains, and that proves the insignificance of the type of diet. Merutunga maintains that the incident took place during Kumārapala's reign⁵ and it is probable that Āmiga served the latter. The fourth story in the *Prabhāvakacaritra* deals with the Bhāṣṇavata-ascetic Devabodha who played a great rôle for some time in Anhilvad and who behaved very arrogantly towards the king and the court-poet Śrīpāla, despite the fact that he was generously patronised by the king. Later on, he was suspected of holding drinking-bouts against the rules of his order. Although he managed to prevent any proof being found of his guilt, he was thenceforward neglected and driven to poverty. At last, he went to Hemacandra and composed a verse in his honour. Hemacandra had pity on him and obtained a lac for him from the king. With that money he paid his debts. Then he went to the bank of the Ganga and awaited his deliverance. This anecdote, too, is mentioned nowhere else. On the contrary, Devabodha is mentioned as an opponent of Hemacandra in Jinamandana's account of Kumārapala's conversion, and it appears as if Rajasekhara (see Note 5) alluded to the latter story.⁶

The fifth and last story of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* deals with Hemacandra's experiences of the pilgrimage which has been already referred to and which Jnyasimha made towards the end of his reign to Somanatha or Devapattana, the present-day Veraval in South Jnyasimha was, so it is said, greatly perturbed because of his having no issue at all. He undertook therefore a pilgrimage on which Hemacandra accompanied him. First of all, they visited Śātruṅḡaya where Jayasimha paid his homage to the first Tirthankara and presented twelve villages to the shrine. From Śātruṅḡaya he proceeded towards Samkall near Gūrnār and viewed therefrom the temple of Nemmatha, which his officer Sajjana had ordered to be huilt out of the revenues of the province Saurāṣṭra, without being authorised to do so. In order to secure the merit of having built the Temple for himself, Jayasimha freed the Governor from the repayment of the sum used, amounting to 27 lacs. Then he climbed the mountain Gūrnār and worshipped the Jina. Then he proceeded with Hemacandra to Somesvarapattana and paid homage to Śiva

whom Hemacandra also praised as the Paramātmān. The last station on the journey was Koṭinagara, the modern Koṭināra in Sorāṭh, where the temple of Ambikā existed. Jayasimha prayed to the Goddess that she might grant him a son. Hemacandra joined his prayers to those of the king and fasted for three days. Then there appeared Ambikā to him and informed him that Jayasimha would get no progeny but would have to leave his kingdom to Kumārāpāla.⁴¹

The same story is found with some omissions and additions in Jinamaṇḍana. The visit of Gīrnār is omitted therein as well as the anecdote of Sajjana's temple and Hemacandra's worship of Śiva. On the other hand, it is said, Jayasimha went, after his visit to Koṭinagara—or Koṭiāri according to the Prakrit from—once again to Somanāthapattana in order to make his request to Śiva. The god appeared in person to the king, and refused to grant him a son.⁴² Wholly different is the story, in Merutuṅga. He is well acquainted with the pilgrimage of Jayasimha. He, however, knows nothing about Hemacandra's taking part in it, and he therefore assumes that Hemacandra composed the verse to Śiva which is quoted in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, while on a visit to Somanāthapattana, which visit he made much later in company with Kumārāpāla. According to him the route of the march was, also, quite different. The king visited first of all Somanāthapattana. On his return, he encamped at the foot of Gīrnār; he did not however climb on the mountain, for the envious Brahmins declared to him that the mountain looked like a Liṅga standing in a water-tank and therefore must not be trodden by foot. From Gīrnār, so it is said by Merutuṅga, Jayasimha wended his way to Śatruñjaya and visited the temples there, despite the opposition of his Brahmin advisers, by night and in disguise. Merutuṅga also mentions the grant of twelve villages. In the same way he knows the story of Sajjana; but he does not bring it in connection with the pilgrimage.⁴³ Nor does he mention the visit to Koṭinagara. Now, if one compares what Hemacandra himself has written about Jayasimha's pilgrimage in the *Dryāsraya*, one sees that the description of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* is decidedly false, while Merutuṅga's account thereof also contains errors. The *Dryāsraya* differs from the *Prabhāvakacaritra* in that it is silent on Hemacandra's participation in the pilgrimage, in that the route of the march is different, although it is the same as given by Merutuṅga, and in that there is no reference to a visit to Koṭinagara and to the revelation of Ambikā. On the contrary, it is assumed that Śiva revealed himself to Jayasimha in Somanāthapattana and informed him of Kumārāpāla's destiny. Going against Merutuṅga's statement, the *Dryāsraya* affirms that Jayasimha climbed the hill Gīrnār and there worshipped the Neminātha. Lastly, he contradicts both the *Prabhāvakacaritra* and Merutuṅga by reporting that from Gīrnār Jayasimha did not go to Śatruñjaya but took the direct route to Simhapur or Sihor, and by saying nothing about the alleged grant of land to the shrine of the first Jina. As Hemacandra quite carefully takes note in the *Dryāsraya* of all other favours granted to his own faith, his silence in this case is very significant.⁴⁴

To these stories from the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, Merutuṅga adds three others, one of which is mentioned also by Jinamaṇḍana. The first two of these are intended to show Hemacandra's erudition. It is said that he alone could explain a Sanskrit verse

sent by the king of Dahala and that it was he who, on another occasion, had at once composed the second half of a Prakrit Dodhala, the first half of which had been sent for Jayasinha's poets as *samasyā* by the king of Sopadalakya. The Sanskrit-verse is the well known riddle with the word *kara*. It belongs to the favourite passages with which the Pandits amuse themselves in their *sabhas* and it is so easy that great scholarship is not needed for its solution."

The third story has quite a different character. Once, says Merutunga, Siddharaja who was seeking the right path to deliverance, ordered an inquiry into the teachings of all sects of all nations. The result was unsatisfactory. Every teacher praised his own faith and censured all the other systems. The king was, therefore, as if seated on a "swing of doubt" and turned finally to Hemacandra in order to know what the proper attitude should be in such circumstances. Hemacandra gave him his advice in the form of a parable, common in the Puranas. He said, there lived a merchant, ages ago, who neglected his own wife and gave away all his property to a courtesan. His wife tried zealously to win back the love of her husband and inquired after all means of magic with which to accomplish her end. Thereupon a Gauda promised her 'to get her husband tied down to her with a bridle' and gave her some medicine with instructions to mix the same in the food. After some days, when the woman put this advice into practice, her husband was turned into a bull. Thereupon the whole world rebuked her, and she fell into deep despondency for she did not know how to undo the effect of her unholy action. Once she took her metamorphosed husband to the pasture for grazing. She sat in the shade of a tree, loudly weeping over her fate. In the meanwhile, she heard a conversation which was being carried on between Śiva and his wife Parvati in a *timana*, flying above in the air. Parvati asked about the cause of the sorrows of the shepherdess and Śiva told her all about it. He also added that a healing herb grew in the shade of that very tree, which was capable of metamorphosing the bull back into his own original form. As the kind of the creeper was not specifically designated, the woman gathered up all that grew under the shade of the tree and threw it before the bull. He ate it, and became a man again. Now, just as the unknown creeper, thus concluded Hemacandra, proved itself to be of a healing virtue, even so also a believing reverence for all religions leads one to salvation, even though one may not know which of them really deserves reverence. From that time the king respected all sects. "Jinamapadana" gives another independent version of the story which is also much better in style. The same author also connects two more little anecdotes with this one. The one speaks of a second conversation over the same question, during which Hemacandra recommended to the king the so-called "common duties" such as generosity to worthy men, becoming behaviour towards venerable persons, kind heartedness towards all beings etc., and declared in the words of the Mahābhārata that those who were devoutly pious in their conduct and not those inclined to self castigation, nor yet the learned, were of real worth. According to the other anecdote, Hemacandra enlightened the king when the latter had a temple of Śiva and another of Mahāvīra built in Siddhapura, that the latter divinity was even greater than the former. For, though Śiva bears the moon on his forehead, all the nine planets may be seen at Mahāvīra's feet. Those who were well-versed in architecture corroborated

this statement and found that the temples of the Jinas were preferable to those of the Brahmanic gods in other respects also, according to the rules in their scriptures. Thereupon, thus it is concluded, Siddharāja descended from himself the darkness of doubt.⁴³

In view of the fact that some of the stories quoted appear to be mythical at the first sight, and that regarding most of the remaining, the *Prabandhas* contradict each other, it would be more than presumptuous to assume any of them as really historical. On the contrary, it is not at all improbable that they describe rightly on the whole the mode and manner in which Hemacandra behaved himself towards the king. Hemacandra would naturally have access to the audience of his lord during the last years of his life. He would have doubtless striven to shine out by his scholarship and amartness and he would have let no opportunity pass unexploited for a good word in favour of his own sect or at least for the equality of rights of the non-Brahmanic sects. In so doing, he would not miss to particularly stress those points in which the Jaina doctrine coincided with the Brahmanic faith. It will be shown later on that like a clever missionary he did not fail also in his works to make use of such points of coincidence, and when it suited his purpose, he invoked the authority of the most popular Brahmanic scriptures in his favour. Lastly, he certainly had ample opportunity of defending himself and his co-religionists against the attacks of envious Brahmins and the statement that he employed such devices, as the one mentioned in connection with the defence of Nemikarita, is not incredible. Such traits are characteristically Indian and they are found very often amongst the Jains. As yet one cannot with absolute certainty measure how great was the influence which Hemacandra exercised over Jayasīmha to the advantage of his own sect. One might give credence, to a certain extent, to Hemacandra's own statement in the *Dvyāśraya*, according to which Jayasīmha built a temple of Mābhavira in Siddhapura and paid his homage to Neminātha on the mountain Gīrnār. For, there are enough examples, in old and recent times, of Indian Princes, who were not bigoted but rather liberal in their religious views, offering many presents to deities of faiths other than their own; indeed they have even worshipped them specially when they had to wait, like Jayasīmha, vainly for the fulfilment of some long-cherished desire. But it is another question whether Jayasīmha's propensity towards Jainism or favouritism towards the same, is to be ascribed exclusively to the efforts of Hemacandra. The most recent researches make it highly improbable that this was the case, for, they show that other Jaina-monks also had access to Jayasīmha's court and were allowed to expound their doctrines to him. Amongst them, there is mention of a second Hemacandra, also named Maladhārīn, who appears, judging from the dates of his works, to have been ten to twenty years older than Hemacandra, the compiler of the *Grammar*. A work belonging probably to the 13th century, says: "Jayasīmha drank the nectar of his speech". In a *Prasasti* composed in about 1400 A. D., it is even said that he converted Jayasīmha and induced him to adorn the Jaina temples in his own kingdom and foreign parts with golden flag-staves and knobs and also to issue an edict which prohibited the killing of animals on 80 days in each year. If one might put one's trust in these latter statements, then the achievements of the grammarian Hemacandra should be very doubtful. Unfortunately

however, the author of the *Prasasti* mentioned, the same Rājasekhara who wrote the *Prabandhakosa*, is so far removed from the events described that one can hardly believe him unconditionally. Besides this older Hemacandra, a Yati named Samudraghoṣa is said to have "entertained the Siddhapati in the capital of Gūjara".⁴ At any rate, these statements are sufficient to prove that the grammarian Hemacandra was not the only Jaina-favourite of Jayasimha, as has been supposed by the *Prabhāvakacarita*, Merutunga and Jinamaṇḍana. He is their hero and they are dazzled by the brilliance of his position at the court of Kumārapāla. These circumstances have naturally influenced their representation of his relationship with Jayasimha.

CHAPTER IV

The Accounts regarding the First Acquaintance of Kumārapāla and Hemacandra

However much the opinions may differ as to Hemacandra's success as a missionary at Jayasimha's court, it is certain that it was his religious zeal and eloquence that was responsible for the conversion of the next Caulukya king. Jayasimha died in the Vikrama-year 1199, his desire of getting a son remaining unfulfilled. After a short inter-regnum, his grandnephew Kumārapāla ascended the throne of Gujarat, being helped by his brother-in-law, General Kṣṇa or Kāṇhaḍa by name, and being elected by the prominent persons of the empire. Kumārapāla's great-grandfather was Kṣemarāja, the eldest son of Bhima I, who, according to one report, had renounced the throne willingly. But according to another report, he was overlooked in succession to the throne because his mother, named Cakulādevī, was a courtesan whom Bhima had received in his harem. Kṣemarāja's son Devaprasāda had been an intimate friend of king Karna, Bhīma's son, and had received from the latter the village Dadhisthali, the present-day Dethli, not far from Anhilvād, as a royal grant. At Karna's death, he burnt himself after having entrusted Jayasimha to his son Tribhuvanapāla. Tribhuvanapāla remained true to the lord of his family, just like his father. In battle, he used to stand before the king so as to protect him with his own body. He must have died long before the end of Jayasimha's rule, as he is not mentioned in the accounts of the last years of this king. As Jayasimha remained childless down to his old age, Kumārapāla naturally stepped into the foreground as the presumptive heir to the throne. In order to convince Jayasimha that his grand-nephew would ascend the throne of Anhilvād after his death, no revelations of Mahādeva or Ambikā, and no prophecies of the court-astrologers, about which the *Dryāśraya* and the *Prabandhas* speak, were needed. But this idea was not at all agreeable to Jayasimha. He bitterly hated Kumārapāla and attempted to kill him. According to Merutuṅga's statement, the reason for his repugnance was Kumārapāla's descent from the courtesan Cakulādevī. According to Jinamapādāna's account, he hoped that, if Kumārapāla were cleared out of the way, Śiva might even yet grant him a son.

When Kumārāpala learned of the king's intentions, he fled from Dethli, and led for several years a wanderer's unsteady life, disguised as a Śivite ascetic. First he seems to have continued staying in Gujarat. Later on, Jayasimha's persecutions, which increased in seriousness day by day, forced him to leave his motherland.¹ The *Prabandhas* relate a number of romantic adventures which are supposed to have taken place at Kumārāpala's flight and during his erratic wandering in Gujarat and in foreign lands, they take great pains in representing Hemacandra as the protector of the persecuted prince and as the prophet of his future greatness. The *Prabhāvakāśitā* contains the following statements about Hemacandra's part in Kumārāpala's destiny. Jayasimha, so it is said, came to Laow through his spies that Kumārāpala was found to be amongst a crowd of three hundred ascetics who had come to Anhilvād. In order to get hold of him, the king invited all of them to a feast. He himself washed the feet of each of them, apparently to show them his reverence, but really in order to find out who amongst them had the signs of royal dignity on the soles of his feet. As soon as he touched Kumārāpala's feet, he found the lines forming a lotus, a flag and a sunshade. He made a signal to his servants with his eyes. Kumārāpala saw the signal and fled most quickly into the dwelling place of Hemacandra, the spies following him. Hemacandra covered him quickly with a heap of palm-leaves under which the official, hastily passing by, forgot to search for him. When the immediate danger was over, Kumārāpala absconded from Anhilvād and reached, after many adventures in the company of another Śivite Brahmin Boraṇ, the neighbourhood of Stambhasthira or Cambay. Having arrived there, he sent his companion into the city to Śimālī Vana Udayana—the same man who had befriended Hemacandra's father, according to the above-mentioned story—and asked him for help. Udayana hesitated to have dealings with an enemy of the king. Thereupon, Kumārāpala, feeling very hungry, went himself to the city by night and came to a Jain-monastery where Hemacandra had taken up his residence during the rainy season. Hemacandra received him cordially, for he at once recognised him from his auspicious signs that this was the future king. He prophesied to him that he would ascend the throne in the seventeenth year and induced Udayana to give him food and money. Then Kumārāpala wandered further and passed here and there in foreign lands for seven years as a Kāpālīka, in company of his wife, Bhopāladevi. In 1199 Jayasimha died. When Kumārāpala received this news, he returned to Anhilvād with a view to securing the throne for himself. On his arrival there, he met one Śrīmat-Simba (?), an otherwise unknown person. Śrīmat-Simba took him to Hemacandra in order to find out an auspicious sign, for he had still doubts as to his attaining the aim. On his entrance, Kumārāpala happened to sit down on the cushioned throne-seat of the monastery and supplied thereby, according to Hemacandra, the longed-for sign. The following day, the prince went with his brother-in-law Kṛṣṇadeva, a Samanta, who had command over 10,000 soldiers, into the palace and was elected the king.²

Merutunga's account of Kumārāpala's flight and wanderings, agrees on the whole with that of the *Prabhāvakāśitā*. As regards the divergences in details, it is to be noted that Hemacandra appears only once in Merutunga's story. Merutunga says nothing about Kumārāpala's being hidden in Anhilvād under the palm-leaves by Hemacandra nor does he mention the second prophecy immediately before the election

to the throne. Ho relates only the story of the meeting in Stambhatirtha, with a few small variations. After Kumārapāla had wandered over various countries on his flight from Anhilvād, he turned towards Cambay with a view to begging Udayana for money for his travels. As Udayana was at the Jaina monastery when Kumārapāla arrived, the latter also went there. There he met Hemacandra who at once prophesied to him that he would become a king ruling over the whole earth. As Kumārapāla would not believe that, Hemacandra wrote his prophecy down and gave one copy to Udayana, the king's counsellor, and another to the prince. Thereupon the latter said: "If it will come true, then thou shalt be the real king; I shall only be dust at thy feet". Hemacandra replied that the kingship was of no consequence to him but that Kumārapāla should not forget his word and should later on be thankful to the Jaina Dharma and faithful to it. Thereupon Kumārapāla was supplied with food and drink at Udayana's own house and was also given the desired money for the journey. Then he turned towards Mālvā where he remained till Jayasimha's death. When the latter died, he returned to Anhilvād and carried his election to the throne into effect with the help of his brother-in-law, Kāhnaḍadeva 'who led him into the palace with his troops ready for war'."

Jinamandana brings Kumārapāla and Hemacandra together much earlier. Ho describes, Kumārapāla had gone to the court to pay his homage, before the king persecuted him. There he saw Hemacandra sitting before the king and went soon afterwards to the monastery in order to meet the monk. There Hemacandra delivered him a sermon and finally made him take a vow "of viewing others' wives thenceforth as sisters".¹³ Jinamandana's version of the story of Kumārapāla's flight is, as far as Hemacandra's part is concerned, a mixture of the stories of both the *Prabhāvakacarita* and the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*. According to his presentation Hemacandra meets—as Merutuṅga says—the fugitive first in Cambay. But the meeting takes place accidentally in a temple outside the gates of Cambay whereto Udayana also comes with a view to paying his homage to Hemacandra. The presence of Udayana is made use of in introducing his whole previous history which Hemacandra relates on being questioned by Kumārapāla as to who the visitor was. Then follows Hemacandra's prophecy and Kumārapāla's hospitable reception at Udayana's house, exactly as in Merutuṅga. On the contrary, it is said that Kumārapāla remained for a long time at his host's. Jayasimha received the news of his sojourn in Cambay and sent soldiers to capture him. Pursued by the latter he fled into Hemacandra's monastery and hid himself there under a heap of manuscripts in the cellar. The last episode is possibly a recast of the story of the first assistance of Devacandra which the *Prabhāvakacarita* relates. Jinamandana appears to have felt that it was absurd to let Hemacandra appear on the scene first at Anhilvād and shortly afterwards at Cambay. Therefore he has probably changed the story of Kumārapāla's rescue under the palm-leaves at the latter place and has added, with a view to making it seem more probable, that the manuscripts lay in the cellar, as is always the case. Jinamandana's further description of Kumārapāla's wandering is much more detailed than in both the other works, and must have had its origin in some other sources. He makes the Prince first turn towards Vajapadma-Baroda, then towards Bhayukaccha-Broach, thence Kolhāpur, Kalyāna, Kāñci and other cities of Deccan and reach finally Mālvā via Pratiṣṭhāna-Paithān. A great part of this section is in verses and appears to be plagiarized from one of the many materials of *Kumārapālacaritas*.¹⁴

CHAPTER V

The Stories Regarding Kumārapāla's Conversion

After these stories which represent Hemacandra as a saviour of the absconding prince and as the prophet of his future greatness, one would expect that soon after Kumārapāla's accession to the throne, there would be a mention of a close friendship between the two. That is, however, not the case. According to both of the oldest works, the intimate intercourse of the monk with the king began much later and that, too, not on account of the earlier beneficence of the monk, but owing to entirely different circumstances. After Kumārapāla had been crowned, so it is said in the *Prabhāralacaritra*, he decided to suppress Arjorāja, the arrogant king of Sapādalakṣa i. e. Eastern Rāyputānā, and accordingly prepared for the war. With all his barons and their troops he proceeded. After some days he reached the fortress Ajamern, the modern Ajmer. He besieged it but could not conquer it despite all endeavours. When the monsoons set in, he returned to Anhilvād without having carried his purpose into effect. At the beginning of the cold season he again set forth, but had, however, to return again at the end of the summer, without having achieved the fall of Ajmer. *Eleven years* passed in this way. Then he once asked his minister Vāgbhata, the son of Udayana, whether there were no deity, Yakṣa or Āsura, who could help him to achieve victory. Vāgbhata advised him to worship an image of Ajitasvāmin which was then obtainable in Anhilvād and which had been consecrated by Hemacandra. Kumārapāla consented and offered Ajitasvāmin presents of very rich substances as required by the Jaina-cult. At the same time, he promised that, in case he conquered his enemy through Ajita's grace, the latter alone should be "his God, his mother, his Guru and father". Then he again proceeded towards Mārvād for the twelfth time. The battle took place in the neighbourhood of the mountain Arbuda-Ābū. Arjorāja was totally beaten. Kumārapāla made a triumphal entry into Anhilvād. He did not forget his promise and offered his worship again in the temple of Ajitanātha. Soon afterwards, he proclaimed to his minister that he wanted to be instructed in the Jaina-tenets and asked him to secure him a teacher. Vāgbhata proposed that Hemacandra be invited to fulfil the king's wish. So it came to pass that Hemacandra preached before Kumārapāla with the result that the latter was moved to take the vows of laymen: to renounce eating flesh and all other forbidden foods, and to study the law of the Jainas.⁶⁰

Merutuṅga's narrative differs very much from the above one and is indeed full of romance. According to his account, Kumārapāla had to combat internal enemies immediately after his winning the crown. Then followed the campaign against Amoraṇḍa or Ānaka of Sapādalakṣa and later a war against Mallikārjuna, the king of Koṅkan, who was beaten by Āmrabhāṭa or Āmbhāṭa, the second son of Udayana. Between these two stories, an anecdote is interwoven about the singer, Sollāka, in which Hemacandra also is mentioned. Contradicting this there is also the account of the way and manner in which Hemacandra became the friend and teacher of Kumārapāla. An insult which Hemacandra received at the funeral of his mother Pāhni from the ascetics of Tripuruṣaprasāda in Anhilvād, drove him—according to Merutuṅga's report—into such anger that he decided to gain influence at the court so that he could take revenge for the insult. He betook himself to the royal camp which happened to be then at Mālvā. His old patron, the councillor Udayana, introduced him to the king. The king remembered his prophecy which Hemacandra had made during his flight. The king offered him his friendship and granted him the honour of access to his person at all times. This intercourse which developed so quickly had, however, no immediate results for the religious conviction of the king. Only a few anecdotes are given, e.g., the one about the quarrel with the Purohita Āmiga (see above p. 20), which prove Hemacandra's dexterity in self-defence against attacks. It was only when Kumārapāla returned sometime afterwards to Anhilvād that Hemacandra found an opportunity of beginning his work of conversion. Once Kumārapāla asked his friend, so it is said, how he could immortalize for all time the memory of his rule. Thereupon Hemacandra advised the king either to pay off every one's debts, as Vikramāditya had done, or to have a new stone-temple built in the place of the dilapidated wood-temple of Śiva-Somanātha in Devapattana. Kumārapāla preferred the latter and deputed at once an official to begin the erection. When it was reported that the foundation-stone had been laid, Hemacandra proposed to the king that he should take a vow for securing the happy conclusion of the project, and to that end either to observe complete chastity or to renounce indulgence in spirituous drinks and flesh-eating until the flag was unfurled on the pinnacle of the temple. Kumārapāla swore before a Śiva-liṅga to abstain from the prohibited drinks and dishes for the required length of time. After two years, the temple was completed and Kumārapāla wanted now to be freed from his vow. Hemacandra, however, prevailed upon him to hold the vow still longer, until he had worshipped the god in the new temple. Immediately, therefore, a pilgrimage towards Somanātha—or Devapattana—was undertaken and, on the advice of the envious Brahmins, Hemacandra also was invited thereto. The latter declared himself to be quite willing to visit the temple of Śiva. He however took first a roundabout route so as to visit the shrines of Śatruñjaya and Gīrnār. At the gate of Devapattana he met the king and took part in the ceremonious entry-procession together with the king and with Gaṇḍa Brhaspati, the temple-priest of Somanātha. He was also moved by the request of his lord to worship even Śiva. Dressed in a costly costume, he entered the temple led by Brhaspati, praised its brilliance, made the usual sacrificial offerings according to the instructions of the *Śivapurāṇa* and threw himself prostrate before the Liṅga, dedicating the following verses to the God:

CHAPTER V

The Stories Regarding Kumārapāla's Conversion

After these stories which represent Hemacandra as a saviour of the absconding prince and as the prophet of his future greatness, one would expect that soon after Kumārapāla's accession to the throne, there would be a mention of a close friendship between the two. That is, however, not the case. According to both of the oldest works, the intimate intercourse of the monk with the king began much later and that, too, not on account of the earlier beneficence of the monk, but owing to entirely different circumstances. After Kumārapāla had been crowned, so it is said in the *Prabhātalacaritra*, he decided to suppress Arjarājs, the arrogant king of Sapādalaśa i. e. Eastern Rājputānā, and accordingly prepared for the war. With all his barons and their troops he proceeded. After some days he reached the fortress Ajameru, the modern Ajmer. He besieged it but could not conquer it despite all endeavours. When the monsoons set in, he returned to Anhilvād without having carried his purpose into effect. At the beginning of the cold season he again set forth, but had, however, to return again at the end of the summer, without having achieved the fall of Ajmer. *Eleven years* passed in this way. Then he once asked his minister Vāgbhata, the son of Udayana, whether there were no deity, Yakṣa or Āsura, who could help him to achieve victory. Vāgbhata advised him to worship an image of Ajitasvāmin which was then obtainable in Anhilvād and which had been consecrated by Hemacandra. Kumārapāla consented and offered *śīṣṭasvāmin* presents of very rich substances as required by the Jaina-cult. At the same time, he promised that, in case he conquered his enemy through Ajita's grace, the latter alone should be "his God, his mother, his Guru and father". Then he again proceeded towards Mārvād for the twelfth time. The battle took place in the neighbourhood of the mountain Arbuda-Ābu. Arjarāja was totally beaten. Kumārapāla made a triumphal entry into Anhilvād. He did not forget his promise and offered his worship again in the temple of Ajitaultha. Soon afterwards, he proclaimed to his minister that he wanted to be instructed in the Jaina-tenets and asked him to secure him a teacher. Vāgbhata proposed that Hemacandra be invited to fulfil the king's wish. So it came to pass that Hemacandra preached before Kumārapāla with the result that the latter was moved to take the vows of laymen: to renounce eating flesh and all other forbidden foods, and to study the law of the Jainas.⁶⁷

Merutuṅga's narrative differs very much from the above one and is indeed full of romance. According to his account, Kumārapāla had to combat internal enemies immediately after his winning the crown. Then followed the campaign against Amoraṇḍa or Ānaka of Sapādalakṣa and later a war against Mallikārjuna, the king of Koṅkan, who was beaten by Āmrabhata or Āmbade, the second son of Udayana. Between these two stories, an anecdote is interwoven about the singer, Sollāka, in which Hemacandra also is mentioned. Contradicting this there is also the account of the way and manner in which Hemacandra became the friend and teacher of Kumārapāla. An insult which Hemacandra received at the funeral of his mother Pāhni from the ascetics of Tripurasaṁprāsāda in Anhilvād, drove him—according to Merutuṅga's report—into such anger that he decided to gain influence at the court so that he could take revenge for the insult. He betook himself to the royal camp which happened to be then at Mālvā. His old patron, the councillor Udayana, introduced him to the king. The king remembered his prophecy which Hemacandra had made during his flight. The king offered him his friendship and granted him the honour of access to his person at all times. This intercourse which developed so quickly had, however, no immediate results for the religious conviction of the king. Only a few anecdotes are given, e. g., the one about the quarrel with the Purohita Āmiga (see above p. 20), which prove Hemacandra's dexterity in self-defence against attacks. It was only when Kumārapāla returned sometime afterwards to Anhilvād that Hemacandra found an opportunity of beginning his work of conversion. Once Kumārapāla asked his friend, so it is said, how he could immortalize for all time the memory of his rule. Thereupon Hemacandra advised the king either to pay off every one's debts, as Vikramāditya had done, or to have a new stone-temple built in the place of the dilapidated wood-temple of Śiva-Somanātha in Devapattana. Kumārapāla preferred the latter and deputed at once an official to begin the erection. When it was reported that the foundation-stone had been laid, Hemacandra proposed to the king that he should take a vow for securing the happy conclusion of the project, and to that end either to observe complete chastity or to renounce indulgence in spirituous drinks and flesh-eating until the flag was unfurled on the pinnacle of the temple. Kumārapāla swore before a Śiva-liṅga to abstain from the prohibited drinks and dishes for the required length of time. After two years, the temple was completed and Kumārapāla wanted now to be freed from his vow. Hemacandra, however, prevailed upon him to hold the vow still longer, until he had worshipped the god in the new temple. Immediately, therefore, a pilgrimage towards Somanātha—or Devapattana—was undertaken and, on the advice of the envious Brahmins, Hemacandra also was invited thereto. The latter declared himself to be quite willing to visit the temple of Śiva. He however took first a roundabout route so as to visit the shrines of Śatruṅḡaya and Gīrnār. At the gate of Devapattana he met the king and took part in the ceremonious entry-procession together with the king and with Ganda Brhaspati, the temple-priest of Somanātha. He was also moved by the request of his lord to worship even Śiva. Dressed in a costly costume, he entered the temple led by Brhaspati, praised its brilliance, made the usual sacrificial offerings according to the instructions of the *Śivapurāṇa* and threw himself prostrate before the Liṅga, dedicating the following verses to the God:

(1) Thou dost exist, whosoever Thou art, whatsoever Thy place, Thy time and Thy name may be! If Thou art the only one, free from stains and errors, then all reverence be to Thee, O Worthy of worship!

(2) Reverence to Him in whom the sorrows and the other causes of the seed of rebirth have vanished; be He Brahman, Viṣṇu or Mahेशvara!

When Hemacandra had finished his prayers, Kumārapāla worshipped, on his part, the god according to the instructions of the priest Brhaspati and distributed rich presents. Then he ordered his retinue to retire and visited, with Hemacandra, the Holiest of the holy. There he asked his friend to explain before the Liṅga truthfully the way to deliverance. Hemacandra meditated for a moment. Then he proposed to appeal to the god who was verily there, that He might manifest Himself and show the way to deliverance. Hemacandra himself undertook to sink into the deepest meditation in order to attain the desired end. He instructed the king to bring immediately incense-offering of aloes-wood. As both of them thus were so busy and the adytum was filled with smoke-clouds, there, appeared all of a sudden a bright light and the beaming form of an ascetic was visible on the water-basin around the Liṅga. The king touched the apparition from its feet up to its head and having convinced himself that it was of divine origin, requested it for advice. Thereupon it told him that Hemacandra would surely lead him to deliverance. The apparition disappeared. The king then requested Hemacandra in all humility for instruction. The latter at once made him take a vow that he would never touch during all his lifetime either meat or spirituous drinks. After a short time, Kumārapāla returned to Aphilvā. He was won over more and more to the Jaina faith through Hemacandra's instructions in the holy scriptures as well as through his works, the *Trisāṁśatāḥśapurusaśāstra* and the *Yogaśāstra* and the twenty stanzas composed in honour of Vitarāga. Kumārapāla also received the title of Paramārāta, "the eager worshipper of the Arbata". He then promulgated an edict prohibiting the killing of animals for fourteen years in the eighteen provinces subject to him. He had 1440 Jaina temples built and took the twelve vows of Jaina-layman. When the third one, prohibiting stealing, was explained to him, he at once decided to break the old custom of confiscating the property of those subjects who had died without leaving an heir.⁶¹

Jinamanḍana essentially agrees with Merutunga. But he felt the inner contradiction which the story of the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* as well as that of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* contained. It appeared to him as unbelievable that Hemacandra who had helped Kumārapāla on his flight and had prophesied his ascending the throne, should have been afterwards forgotten for so many years and that he could have obtained access to the court only through the intervention of the Jaina minister. He has therefore interwoven a new story at the beginning of his account. The story is to show that Hemacandra went to the court very soon after Kumārapāla's coronation. This story, however, betrays quite clearly that the author had the knowledge of the older accounts and that he had changed them deliberately. After enumerating the presents which were given to the councillor Udayana and to the other benefactors of the king, he

CHAPTER V.—THE STORIES REGARDING KUMĀRAPĀLA'S CONVERSION 31

says, Hemacandra was absolutely forgotten. In spite of that, he went to Anhilvād from Karnāvati a short time after Kumārapāla's coronation. He then asked Udayana whether the king remembered him. As the reply was in the negative, he requested Udayana to warn the king against visiting on a certain day the palace of his queen. He also permitted Udayana to mention his name in case the king insisted on knowing the name of the warner. Udayana brought home the warning to the king who acted accordingly. On the said day, the palace of the queen caught fire from lightning and was burnt to ashes. Thereupon the king asked the name of the unknown adviser. When Hemacandra's name was mentioned, he was at once summoned by the king who promptly begged to be excused in all humility for his forgetfulness and promised him to rule entirely according to his counsel.⁶³ After showing that Hemacandra became Kumārapāla's friend and advisor soon after V. S. 1199, Jinamandana gives a short account of "the conquest of the world" by the king. In the subsequent account he follows wholly and literally Merutuṅga, excepting, of course, in one point, that is, he says nothing about the insult hurled at Hemacandra at the funeral of Pālini and about the subsequent journey to Mālvā. The statements naturally did not suit him. In some details, he is more extensive than Merutuṅga and lengthens the account of Kumārapāla's conversion very much by many quotations which he attributes to Hemacandra.⁶⁴

CHAPTER VI

Hemacandra's own Account of Kumārapāla's Conversion

If we compare these various stories about Kumārapāla's conversion with each other, it cannot be denied that the one given by Merutuṅga is written with very great dexterity and that his presentation is at first sight very attractive. It appears so natural that because of an insult from a Brahmin, Hemacandra should have thought of giving up his independence and placing himself under the protection of the king. The clever way in which he moves Kumārapāla for a certain time to follow some of the most important tenets of Jainism while at the same time he takes care not to put anything in the way of his patron's reverence to Śiva, in fact he greatly encourages him in that,—betrays clearly the difficult situation in which he found himself in the court. This adaptation and apparent relaxation, the fooling of the king by a hocus-pocus and the subsequent clever exploitation of the favourable moment—all this seems quite credible and fits in very well with the character and the method of the Jaina-missionaries. On closer examination, however, many improbabilities or impossibilities are found in the account. It is easy to recognise, for example, that Merutuṅga indulges in an awful anachronism when he assumes that Udayana was Kumārapāla's minister and introduced Hemacandra to the king. According to Merutuṅga's own account (p. 9), Udayana came to Gujarat shortly after the beginning of Jayasīma's rule i. e. about V. S. 1130. Kumārapāla ascended the throne about 50 years later, in V. S. 1199. It is then simply impossible that he could have lived still for any length of time under Kumārapāla or that he could ever have served him. Merutuṅga's assumption, too, that Hemacandra advised the rebuilding of the temple in Derapattana, does not at all agree with the statements in an older document. For, in the inscription dated Valabhi-Samrat 550 or V. S. 1225 in the temple of Bhadrakālī at Derapattana, which was first of all made known by Colonel J. Tod, it is quite explicitly said in the 11th verse that the Gaṇḍa Brhaspati, who had already been in great favour with Jayasīma, persuaded Kumārapāla to rebuild the ruined temple of Śiva-Somanātha.⁶ Such an assumption has, since it dates from the time of Kumārapāla's reign, significantly far more probability than Merutuṅga's much later statement. If this inscription be in the right, then the whole further narrative of the *Prabandhaśāntamṛta* becomes unbelievable. If ever these points raise suspicion against the faithfulness of the tradition contained in Merutuṅga's works, then the same

tradition and also the narrative of the *Prabhāvalacarita* prove as almost completely worthless in light of Hemacandra's own utterances about Kumārapāla's history and his relationship to him. Hemacandra devotes no less than four *sargas* XVI-XIX in the *Dvyāśrayakāvya* to the description of the successful war which Kumārapāla led against Arnorāja, king of Śākambharī-Sambhar in Rājputānā, and against Ballāla, king of Mālvā. Although no definite dates are given, it may yet be taken as certain from the description that Kumārapāla was involved in external complications soon after his coronation and that a considerable time had passed before he emerged successfully from them. The war with Arnorāja began immediately after Kumārapāla's coronation and appears to have lasted for a considerable number of years. Soon afterwards followed the campaign against Ballāla, which appears to have ended in a shorter time. After this was over, so it is said in the XX *sarga*, Kumārapāla prohibited killing of animals in Gujarat. After the king had published the edict to protect the animals, it is said further, he gave up the custom of confiscating the property of those who died without leaving behind an heir. Later on, he had the temple of Śiva at Kedāra or Kedārnātha in Garhwal and at Devapattana in Kāśhīrāj rebuilt, and thereupon he had the temple of Pūrvaṇātha in Anhilvāj and Devapattana erected, the former of which bore the name Kumāravihāra. The last events of the time of Kumārapāla's reign, as mentioned in the *Dvyāśraya*, are the building of a temple of Śiva in Anhilvāj and the foundation of a new era which bore his name.⁴⁵ From these statements one may conclude with absolute certainty that Kumārapāla's conversion to Jainism took place after the war with Mālvā. It also becomes probable that Hemacandra, although he does not touch upon his own relationship to the king by a single word in the *Dvyāśraya*, was acquainted with the king earlier and had influence over him. The latter conclusion is fully corroborated by a passage in another work of Hemacandra. In his *Mahāvīracarita* Hemacandra makes Tīrthaṅkara deliver a prophecy on Kumārapāla's reign to Prince Abhaya, in which his name occurs and in which the beginning of his acquaintance with the king is related. After Mahāvīra's preliminary description of the city of Anhilvāj, he proceeds further as follows :

45-46. When, O Abhaya, 1669 years will have passed after my Nirvāṇa, then there will live in that city (Anhilvāj) the long-armed king Kumārapāla, the moon of the Caulukyn-line, a powerful lord of all.

47. This large-hearted one, a hero in the fulfilment of the law, in generosity and in the battle, will lead his people to the highest prosperity, protecting it as a father.

48. Very clever and yet of upright mind, in his majesty fiery as the sun and yet filled with the peace of the soul, punishing arrogant attacks and yet always ready to forgive, he will protect the world for a long time.

49. He will make his people like unto himself, firm in the fulfilment of the law, even as a wise teacher trains a good pupil.

50. Granting protection to those who seek it, and like as a brother to the wives of other men, he will esteem the sacred law above riches and as life.

Hemacandra's sermons. Merutuṅga's detailed account contradicts Hemacandra's own account still more, as may easily be seen. There are only two points in which the *Prabandhas* agree to some extent with Hemacandra, thereby preserving real tradition. In the first place, they are no doubt correct when they state that Kumārapāla's Jaina minister introduced Hemacandra to the court and was interested in creating favourable ground for his faith. For, the mention of the "Jaina" minister, who according to the *Mahāvīracarita* accompanied the king to the temple, is not made without any reason. We may take it for granted that it was this Jaina companion who occasioned Hemacandra's acquaintance with the king and who induced the latter to visit the temple. Most probably the minister was Vāgbhaṭa, son of Udayana, whom the *Prabhāvākaritra* mentions in the above-mentioned narrative of conversion. The poem in praise of the Kumāravihāra written by Hemacandra's pupil Vardhamāna testifies that Vāgbhaṭa really belonged to the group of the ministers of Kumārapāla. Several stories of the *Prabandhas* maintain that Hemacandra consecrated either in V. S. 1211 or 1213 the temple which Vāgbhaṭa had built in Śatruñjaya in memory of his father who had fallen in the battle against Navaghaṇa, the Cūḍāsamā king of Vāmanasthali. One *Prabandha* says, further, that Hemacandra did the same service in V. S. 1220 to Āmrabhaṭa, second son of Udayana, for his temple of Suvrata in Broach, whereas the other *Prabandhas* (see under) relate a legend about Hemacandra's healing of Āmrabhaṭa.⁶¹ If to this be added Merutuṅga's statement, even though an anachronism, that Hemacandra was introduced to Kumārapāla by the father of both the brothers (p. 29), then it does not seem too bold to regard the family of Udayana as the primo cause of Hemacandra's influence at the court of Anhilvād and to regard him as the family's particular protégé. A second historical element in the stories of the *Prabandhas* is the statement that Kumārapāla's conversion took place, not in the beginning but about the middle of his reign. Here also they agree, as has been shown, with Hemacandra's statements.

The exact date of this event appears to have been preserved in the drama, already referred to above, the *Moharājaparājaya* by the councillor Yaśāhpāla. The conversion of the king is allegorically mentioned as his marriage with the princess Kṛpāsundarī i. e. the beautiful Mercy, the daughter of Dharmarāja and the Viratidevī. Hemacandra is mentioned as the Priest who ordained the marriage tie before Arhat. According to the quotation of Jinamandana from the *Moharājaparājaya*, this marriage took place in V. S. 1216, Mārga sudi 2. If, as may be well supposed, this date really occurred in the drama, then it must be taken as authentic, for the *Moharājaparājaya* was written, as is shown in the Note G, a few years after the death of Kumārapāla, between V. S. 1220 and 1232.⁶² We may also add to this that Kumārapāla received the title *Paramaśrāvaka* i. e. 'the most eager hearer (of the Jaina-doctrine)', in the colophon of an old MS. which was written five years later, in V. S. 1221; while his conversion is not mentioned in a Jaina-inscription of V. S. 1213.⁶³

If we accept now V. S. 1216 as the date of Kumārapāla's conversion, then we may place his first meeting with Hemacandra one or two years earlier. Even if the *Mahāvīracarita* assumes that the king, after coming to know the distinguished Teacher, "will hasten to revere him daily", it is of no avail to weigh these words as of gold. It

must have taken a long period of secret intrigues before the king allowed himself to visit the Jaina Upāśraya and to sit at the feet of Hemacandra as a listener to the sermon. However, as to the manner in which the gradual friendship was formed and how Hemacandra won the favour and the confidence of the king, we may at least put forward certain assumptions, not wholly baseless, with the help of some suggestions from his other works, even though we may fail to attain full certainty. But before these remarks are made, it is necessary to go over Hemacandra's activities during the period from V. S. 1199, the year of Jayasimha's death, until his acquaintance with Kumārapāla in V. S. 1214 or V. S. 1215.

As has been said above on p. 18, Hemacandra had undertaken, after his appointment as the Court-Pandit about V. S. 1194, the task of writing a complete series of manuals for the worldly sciences and specially for Sanskrit Composition. Of these, the Grammar and its appendices with the commentary, perhaps also both of the Sanskrit Lexica and the first fourteen cantos of the *Dīpāśayalāṭya* were completed before Jayasimha's death. After V. S. 1199 he appears to have pursued his plan further without worrying the loss of his position in the court, and worked on tirelessly as a private scholar. The first work belonging to this period, is his Manual of Poetics, the *Alamkāraśūdhāmāṇi*.¹⁰ In the above-mentioned (Note 38) passage of the same it is said that it was written after the completion of the Grammar, and another very striking circumstance shows quite clearly that its compilation took place at a time when the author did not enjoy royal favour. For, the dedication, the compliment to the ruler of Gujarat, is lacking not only in the text but also in the commentary which contains a great number of verses. This latter point is all the more weighty as it was a fashion of the court-writers on poetics always to add verses in honour of their patrons. And Hemacandra himself is no exception, for we find him missing no opportunity of flattering his lord in two of his other works. The one case in point occurring in the Commentary on his Grammar was mentioned above. The second one will be forthwith discussed. Particularly in a work on Poetics it would have been easy to celebrate the heroic deeds of Jayasimha or Kumārapāla in the same way as is done by the older Vāgbhata in his *Alamkāraśāstra*.¹¹ As, however, this does not happen, it can well be supposed that the author at the time of writing the work, had no connection with the king and it is not hard to determine that that was the period between Jayasimha's death and the beginning of the acquaintance with Kumārapāla. The same is true about the *Chandonuśāsana*,¹² the work on Metrics, which was written, as is evident from the introductory verses, immediately after the *Alamkāraśūdhāmāṇi*; as also about the Commentary belonging to it. Here, too, we miss the dedication and the compliments to the king in the illustrations. Moreover, it is to be noted that the texts of both of these manuals were first finished and the commentary on the *Alamkāraśūdhāmāṇi* was written just after the completion of the *Chandonuśāsana*. This is evident from the fact that Hemacandra refers to the latter in the former and speaks of it as a completed work.¹³ Also numerous supplements to both the great Sanskrit *Kośas* had their origin in that period as well as, surely, the text of the Prakrit Lexicon, the *Deśināmamālā* or *Ratnāraṇ*. To the supplements belongs, first of all, the *Śevākhya Nāmamālā* which purports to complete the *Abhūdhanacintāmaṇi*, and which contains particularly extracts from Yādavaprakāśa's *Vaijayanṭi*.¹⁴ Then the *Nighaṇṭu* or *Nighaṇṭuśeṣa*,

known so little as yet, is to be mentioned. The tradition of the Jaina-scholars assumes that Hemacandra wrote six small works of this name. However, only three of them are so far discovered. Two give short survey of botanic names while the third deals with precious stones.⁷⁴ It is not improbable that these works were written in imitation of the older *Dharmavartanighaṇṭu* and the *Ratnaparikṣā*. Also in these works one misses that hint that they were written at the king's command. However, a doubt may be raised at least with regard to the *Śeṣākhyā Nāmamālā*, whether it was written between V. S. 1199 and 1214/15, for the same has been inserted in many MSS. in the Commentary of the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* and this latter belongs, as will be shown below, to the last years of Hemacandra's life. The *Deśināmamālā*, on the other hand, was probably written shortly before Hemacandra's acquaintance with Kumārapāla. For, Hemacandra suggests in the third verse of the Introduction and says in the explanation of the same verse (pp. 2-3) quite expressly that he had previously completed not only his Grammar but also his Sanskrit-Koṣas and his Manual of Poetics. On the other hand, the commentary, which was certainly written later, contains no less than fifteen verses in which the king is mentioned by name, while in nine others the designation Cālukya or Cūlukya occurs and a great number of them are addressed simply to the king. These verses, all of which are applicable to Kumārapāla, praise his heroic deeds, describe the greatness of his glory and the misery of his foes, or praise his generosity. In one place, there seems also an allusion to a particular historical event. It is said in VI, 118:

"O Thou, whose courage emits unbroken sparks, O Lord of the goddess of Victory, does not thy fame resemble about freely, just like an unchaste Cāṇḍāla-woman, even in the Palli-land?"

The Palli-land is the district of Palt in Rājputānā between Jodhpur and Ajmer. It is to be recognised, therefore, that in this verse there is an allusion to Kumārapāla's victory over Arpōrja, the king of Sapāḍslakṣa, or Śākambhari-Sāmbhar.

Whatever may be thought of this verse, there remains, however, the very conspicuous fact that Hemacandra in the Commentary to his *Deśināmamālā* glorifies only the victory and the bravery of Kumārapāla but does not speak of his piety and of his faith in the Jaina tenets. This fact strengthens the conclusion that this work was written after Hemacandra had obtained access to Kumārapāla's court, but before he began his work of conversion. Therefore, the date of the compilation of the Commentary must roughly be V. S. 1214-15. The above-mentioned fact further gives a scent as to the way and manner in which Hemacandra began to win the favour of the king. First of all, he appears to have made use of his temporal art and worldly knowledge to create a favourable impression. After his introduction by his patron, the minister Vāghbhaṭa, he probably received the permission to appear at the usual daily audience of the scholars. His position is naturally prominent from the outset. His reputation as a scholar had been for long firmly established and it could not have failed to influence Kumārapāla, even if the latter began to study, as an anecdote given by Merutuṅga reports, the sciences just in his old age. Hemacandra would certainly not have bidden his light under a bushel but would have radiated it through his deep erudition at the discussions of the scholars in the king's presence. Apart from the strictly scientific accomplishments, he undoubtedly influenced the king

by his panegyrics on Kumarapala's war-activities of which the verses partly very cleverly composed in the commentary on the *Desanumamala* give examples. There was probably no lack of opportunity for religious discussions at the Court. According to all accounts, Kumarapala was about fifty years old when he ascended the throne and when the completion of his war-expeditions allowed him to take rest he had attained his sixty-third year. That at such an age he turned to religious questions can well be understood, this being usual especially in the case of Indras. Moreover, be it noted that for years he wandered here and there, as the *Prabandhas* would have us believe, as a Śivaite ascetic and that he, as Hemacandra says in the *Yogasūtra* (see Note 80), had "seen" various manuals of the Yoga and took great interest in the Yogic practices of the ascetics, which would first of all bring supernatural powers and finally would lead to deliverance. Hemacandra also was very expert in these doctrines, as his last-named work shows, and he appears to have performed the prescribed spiritual exercises himself for he bases his description of the practices on personal experience (Note 80). So far, the circumstances were well favourable to persuade even a king to abandon Śaivism to which his race had paid homage from time immemorial and to go over to the heterodox Jaina sect which was very influential and had been honoured in Gujarat for many years. As his works show, Hemacandra was never in want of skill. He probably began with caution and, as the *Prabandhas* state, he emphasised wherever possible the harmony between the doctrines of Jainism and those of the orthodox systems. The *Kumarapalacarita*, pp. 124 ff., particularly gives long sermons in extenso, in which Hemacandra attempts to prove the identity of Jins and Śiva as well as Viṣṇu and refers to the canonical works of the Brahmins for the doctrine of preserving the life of animals. However little one may rely on the wording of these and similar passages, they without doubt clearly show the way in which Hemacandra approached the works. For in the commentary on his *Yogasūtra* he cites among other things, passages from the Brahmanical works with the introductory words "So say even the believers of false doctrines" in confirmation of the Jaina doctrines, and also in the text of this work (II, 21, 26), Manu's words against meat-eating, with mention of his name, are given. There is however no trace in his works of an identification of the Brahmanical gods with the Jinas. In spite of this, it is quite possible that he made use of them in his sermons, they were usual even in the 12th century. In the *Mangala* to the Nāṇdol deed of presentation of the princes Alhana and Kelhana of V S 1218, we read

'To liberation may also the gods Brahman, Śrīdhara and Śaṅkara lead [us,] who, always renouncing passions, are known in the world as Jinas!'

However, Hemacandra's task had been troublesome and success did not crown it so rapidly as too strict an interpretation of the above-mentioned passage from the *Mahavivacarita* would have us believe. It is particularly likely that, as the *Prabandhas* relate, Hemacandra was continually disturbed in his work by hostile influences and that all the Brahmins were bent upon to counteract his influence over the king and, above all, to hinder the formal conversion of the latter. Merutunga's above-mentioned anecdotes, according to which malicious and envious people set traps for Hemacandra, describe the general situation quite rightly, even if one might not agree in details. In the same way

Jinamandana's story, which relates that Rājācārya Devabodhi, the spiritual instructor of the king, champions the old religion, may have an historical basis despite the fact that the story in its present setting is purely mythical.¹³ The event most probably did not take place without a hard fight. Without doubt, the already mentioned *Yogasāstra* particularly played a very essential part in keeping Kumārapāla firm in his new faith, as is mentioned in the *Prabandhas*.¹⁴ Hemacandra wrote it under order of his lord.¹⁵ In the concluding stanza of the work, XII, 55, it is said:

"This secret doctrine of Yoga, which a part here and a part there has been learnt from the holy scriptures, from the mouth of a good teacher and from one's own experience and which rouses wonder in the minds of the competent public, has been dressed in words by the teacher Hemacandra as a result of the earnest request of the illustrious Caulukya king Kumārapāla."

The same thing is expressed in the two stanzas at the end of the commentary, which immediately follow the above ones.

1. "Owing to the request which the illustrious Caulukya king made to me, I wrote this commentary on the *Manual of Yoga*—so named by me—an ocean of the Nectar of Truth. May it enjoy (its existence) so long as these three worlds—Earth, Air and Heaven—possess the Jaina-doctrine."

2. "Through the merit which I attained by the *Manual of Yoga* and its exposition, may the good man be induced to win for himself the enlightenment of Jina."

Also in the colophon to each of the twelve *Prakāśas*, each time it is mentioned that Kumārapāla wished to hear the work and that it was "crowned" (*saṃjātapaṭṭabandha*), that is, it received the royal approbation. The first four chapters, already published, which form more than three-fourths of the whole, give a short resumé of the Jaina-doctrine, particularly as it affects the position of layman, and the very extensive commentary enlarges the same to the most lucid and comprehensible exposition of the system which has ever been written. The author clearly indicates that this part is written with a view to instructing his lord for, in the commentary, he often particularly and exhaustively dwells upon the duties of a Jaina king. The last eight *Prakāśas* deal with the actual Yoga, the ascetic practices which lead finally to *mukti* or deliverance. The exposition of this part, after which the work is in fact named, is very short and only occupies something like a tenth of the whole *Vṛtti*. It is remarkable that a very long description of those practices precedes the Jaina-Yoga, which, in the author's own words, are useless for attaining *mukti*, but which afford, on the contrary, a peep into the future and grant supernatural powers. It appears that Hemacandra also believed in their efficacy and perhaps devoted himself to them. If he finds so much place as one long chapter for their description, it must have been in consideration of the excessive love of the king for the Yoga-praxis about which he relates in the commentary on XII, 55. The *Vitarāgastotra* which was similarly composed for Kumārapāla, perhaps even earlier than the *Yogasāstra*,

might have received less significance. It gives a short presentation of the Jaina-tenets in the form of a *Prasāṅgi* to Jina¹¹. The text of the *Yogasūtra*, as also the *Vitarāgasūtra*, was probably written shortly after V S 1216. The commentary, on the other hand, was probably completed a few years later. The very significant extent of the latter leads us to suppose that Hemacandra worked on it for a considerable time even if he were ever so diligent and even if he had taken the help of his pupils.

CHAPTER VII

The Consequences of Kumārapāla's Conversion

Now, in regard to the question, what practical results Hemacandra achieved through Kumārapāla's conversion, the prophecy in the *Mahāvīracarita* gives a very clear answer, besides the above-mentioned (p. 33) information in the *Dvyāśrayakāvya*. The prophecy continues after the description of the conversion, already noted, as follows :-

59. "He (Kumārapāla) will keep everyday to the vows, particularly to those relating to rice, vegetables, fruits and others (other foods), and will generally practise chastity."

60. "This wise man will not only avoid courtesans, but will admonish his lawful wives to practise chastity."

61. "According to the instruction of that monk (Hemacandra), he, who knows the general principles (of the faith), the doctrine of that which has soul and of that which has no soul, and so forth, will, like a teacher, procure enlightenment for others also."

62. "Even the Brāhmanas of the Pāṇḍuraṅga (sect) and others, who hate the *Arhat*, will, at his command, become equal to those who are born in the faith."

63. "This man, learned in the law, will, after having taken the vow of a believer, not take his meals without having worshipped in the Jaina temples and without having bowed before the teachers."

64. "He will not take the property of men who have died without leaving sons. That is the result of right insight; for, (only) those without insight are never satisfied."

65. "He himself will give up hunting, which even the Pāṇḍus and others (pious kings of ancient times) did not give up; and all other people will give it up at his command."

66. "As he has prohibited the harming of living creatures, there can be no thought of injury and other things like that; even a man of the lowest birth will not kill even bugs, lice and the like (insects)."

67. "After he has forbidden hunting, game of all kinds will chew the cud in the forest, undisturbed as cows in the cow-shed."

68. "He, who equals Indra in might, will always insist upon the care of all living beings, whether they live in water, on land or in air."

69. "Even the creatures which eat meat from their birth will, as a result of his command, forget the very mention of meat like an evil dream."

70. "Spirituos drinks (the enjoyment of which) has not been given up by the Daśārhas, though they believe in the Jina, will be prohibited everywhere by this (prince) with the pure soul."

71. "So thoroughly will he stop the preparation of spirituous drinks throughout the world, that even the potter will no longer make liquor jugs."

72. "The drunkards, who are impoverished because of their passion for intoxicants, will prosper again, after they have given up drink at his command."

73. "He will destroy the very name of the game of dice, which Nala and other princes had not given up, like the name of a personal foe."

74. "So long as his glorious reign lasts, there will be no pigeon-race and no cock-fights"

75. "In almost every village, he, whose wealth is immeasurable, will adorn the earth with temples of Jina."

76. "On the whole earth, as far as the ocean, he will cause the statues of the Arhat to be borne in procession on cars, in every village, in every town."

77. "After he had continually given money away, and redeemed every one's debts, he will introduce his era on the earth."

78. "Once he will hear, on the occasion of a story related through the mouth of his teacher, about that (Jina-) statue buried in the dust, which the seer Kapila consecrated."

79. "Then he will form the desire: 'I shall dig up the sandy place, and shall have the all-consecrating statue brought hither.'"

80. "When the king is conscious of such great enthusiasm, and also learns of other auspicious signs, then he will be convinced that the statue will reach his hands."

81. "Then, after obtaining the permission of his teacher, he will give the order to his officials to dig up that place of Vīṭabhaya."

82. "Then, as a result of the purity of the king, who is faithful in his devotion to the Arhat, the goddess, who keeps a watch over the holy doctrine, will appear."

83. "As a result of the extremely great merit of the king Kumārapāla, the statue will soon come to light, when the place is excavated."

84. "Then, too, the grant of villages, which king Udayana had made to this statue, will come to light."

85. "The king's officials will place this old statue in a car, as if it were a new one, after having done honour to it as is prescribed."

86. "Whilst, on the way, divine service of various kinds is being held, whilst concerts are being given day and night without interruption,"

87. "Whilst the women of the villages clap their hands loudly and rejoice, whilst the five-toned drums sound joyously,"

88. "Whilst the fans rise and fall on either side, the officials will convey this holy statue to the boundary of Pattana."

89. "Accompanied by the ladies of his palace and his servants, surrounded by the four columns of his host, the king will go to meet it with the whole community."

90. "Dismounting from his chariot himself and mounting the state elephant, the prince will escort the image into the city."

91. "After Kumārapāla has erected it in a pleasure-house near his palace, he will pay homage to it, as prescribed, morning, noon and night."

92. "After he has read the grant made to the statue, he will confirm that which was given by Udayana."

93. "That temple built solely of gold, O Crown Prince, as its splendour appears to be incredible, will arouse the wonder of the whole world."

94. "After the statue has been erected within it, the prince will increase in might, wealth and highest happiness."

95. "Through his devotion to the gods, through his devotion to the teacher, King Kumārapāla will resemble thy father, O Abhaya, in the Bhārata land."

If we now compare these statements with those of the *Dvyāśrayakāvya*,²² we see that Kumārapāla strove after making Gujarat, in certain respects, a model Jaina-state. He renounced not only for himself the enjoyments and pleasures prohibited by the Jaina-doctrine but he induced also his subjects to impose upon themselves the same privations. He issued an ordinance which required the protection of the animal life to the greatest extent, and which was applied most vigorously in all parts of his empire. The Brahmins who killed animals while performing sacrifices were, as the *Dvyāśraya* says, forced to give up the practice and to use corn instead of flesh. Also in the Pallidēsa in Rājputānā one had to submit to that ordinance, and the ascetics of that region, who used to wear antelope-skin, found it hard to procure the same. So it happened, as is said in the *Mahāvīracarita*, that Paṇḍurāṅga, i. e. Śivaites, and other Brahmins had to live like born Śravakas. Prohibition of hunting, about which the latter work speaks, was the natural consequence of this edict and, according to the *Dvyāśraya*, even the inhabitants

of the Pañcaladeśa, that is, the tribes of the middle Kathiāvad, who were great offenders, had to bow to the same order. A further result was the measure, mentioned in the *Dryasraya*, against the butchers who had to give up their trade and received as compensation a lump sum of their three years' income. According to the *Mahāvīracarita* the protection of animal life was extended even to noxious insects. If we trust Merutunga, this statement is no exaggeration at all. For, he describes in the *Yukarharaprabandha*¹ how a 'simple-minded merchant, in the land of Sapadalakṣa, who had crushed a louse, was dragged to Anhilvad by the officer in charge of enforcing the law for the protection of animals, and how, as a punishment for his offence, he had to build the *Yīkavhara* at the cost of the whole of his fortune. Out of all proportion as this punishment may seem, it was merciful in comparison with the punishment which, according to the *Prabhavakarita* was incurred by Lakṣa the bearer of the betel-bowl of Kelhana, the Prince of Nadula-Narīdol. When it was known that Lakṣa had placed a dish of raw meat before the Lokāloka-Chartya in Anhilvad he was sentenced to death.

Along with the prohibition of meat-eating spirituous drinks were also forbidden in conformity with the second Jaina Gansvratā. The same is the case with the game of dice, animal fights and betting which last the third Gupavratā designates as abominable. The *Dryasrayalāhrya* says nothing about the edicts regarding these two points. They are, however, mentioned in the *Prabandhas*.² As the above mentioned story by Merutunga shows, and as Jinamanḍana expressly corroborates it, Kumārāpāla appointed special officers to enforce the execution of his edicts. Finally of very great significance for the Jaina community was the law abolishing the practice of confiscating the property of those merchants who left behind them no sons but widows. It appears that this cruel custom which contradicts the principles of the *Smṛtis* prevailed from ancient times in various provinces, particularly in the west of India. Already Kālidāsa, whose home was Malva bordering on Gujarat knows of this custom and mentions it in the *Abhyananāśakuntala*. There the minister informs the king Duṣyanta that the merchant Dhanavrdhni has perished in a shipwreck and that as he has left no direct descendants (*anapatya*) his property of many millions must be confiscated for the royal treasury. Duṣyanta, who is of yielding nature owing to his own childlessness declares first of all that he will give up his claim in favour of a pregnant wife of the deceased but reconsiders the matter afterwards and issues an edict abolishing such confiscations altogether. From this story, which surely does not belong to the old *Sakuntala*-saga but was invented by Kālidāsa, one may certainly conclude that the confiscation of the property of childless merchants was in vogue in the sixth century of the Christian era, at least in the birthplace of the poet. It is evidently clear that this custom hit the Jains particularly hard for the majority of them lived by commerce and money-transactions. The orthodox kings would probably have treated them, without consideration as heretics. One can therefore easily understand that Kumārāpāla's decision, as is said in the *Dryasrayamahālakṣya*, was greeted with great enthusiasm and that not only the *Prabandhas* but also the Brahmin Somēśvara in the *Kīrtikāumudī* highly praised the king.³

Apart from these coercive measures, Kumārāpāla proved his zeal for the Jaina-faith by building temples, by at least one grant of land, and by his placing the Jaina-cult

on a perfectly equal footing with the Brahmanical fellowships of faith. This last point is mentioned only in the *Mahāvīracarita*; verse 76 says that Kumārapāla everywhere "ordered to carry in a procession the statues of the Arhat in solemn dresses on cars." We must understand this expression in this way that the king did not himself institute Jaina-Rathayātrīs in all places but he gave permission to celebrate these to the small communities throughout the country. As is well-known, Indians are never so enthusiastic, as when they carry in public processions images of gods placed on high cars. Now the minority sects are, whenever possible, prevented to carry on their *yātrās* by those in majority and particularly the Jaines suffer in this respect from the pressure of other sects. Even in recent years there took place a keen fight in Delhi between the Vaiṣṇavas and the Digambaras on account of the *rathayātrā* which the latter wanted to organize. There is no doubt that during the time of the orthodox kings, the Śvetāmbaras of Gujarat were not permitted to exhibit their divine images in public and that Kumārapāla was the first king to grant that privilege to them. If this explanation be accepted, the assertion of the *Mahāvīracarita* that the *rathayātrās* took place in every village is not unbelievable. For, almost every village in Gujarat has its small Jaina *samgha* which consists of dealers in money and merchants. As regards the temple-buildings, the *Dvyāśrayakāvya* speaks of only two, namely, the Kumāravihāra in Anhilvād and another, also equally important, in Davapattana. The *Mahāvīracarita*, on the contrary, opines in verse 75 that "almost every" village maintained a Jaina Caitya, but it refers particularly to a single one in Anhilvād, which must be the Kumāravihāra. The first assertion is naturally an exaggeration as befits the prophetic style. One must understand the statements of the *Mahāvīracarita* probably to mean that Kumārapāla had a great number of small public edifices erected, which apparently were not important enough to be given separate names, and, besides these, the great, beautiful temple in Anhilvād. With the help of this interpretation, the temples mentioned in the *Mahāvīracarita* may well be reconciled with those mentioned in the *Dvyāśraya*, if we accept that the latter wants to mention only the most noteworthy edifices and that it was written somewhat later than the *Mahāvīracarita*. The *Prabandhas* also mention many of these temples. The *Prabhāvakacaritra* speaks, first of all, of the Kumāravihāra at Anhilvād, whose foundation it ascribes to the minister Vāgbhaṭa. Afterwards, it relates that the king ordered to be erected 32 small Vihāras as penance for the sins of his teeth; that he erected moreover a statue of Neminātha in the temple of his father, Tihunapāla or Tribhuvanapāla; that he had a temple built on the mountain Śatruñjaya; and that he adorned all *deśasthānas*, i. e. the main places in each province, with the Jaina-Caityas. Right at the end of this work, we find also the story from the *Mahāvīracarita* about the discovery of the image of the Arhat in the ruins of Vitabhaya.²²

Merutuṅga's numbers are still greater. First of all he speaks about 1440 temples which were built in various provinces. Further on, it is said that Kumārapāla had in Vāgbhaṭapura near Śatruñjaya an image of Pārśvanātha erected in a temple, Tribhuvanpālavihāra, so named in honour of his father. Then, the thirty-two 'atonement' temples are also mentioned, as also the Kumāravihāra whose building, however, is not described. Finally, four more temples are mentioned: (1) the Mūṣakavihāra which was built at Anhilvād in order to atone for the death of a mouse which died out of despair

because Kumarapala had deprived it of its prize on his flight from Jayasinha, (2) the Karamavibhara which was built in Aphilvād in honour of an unknown woman who had fed Kumarapala with a rice dish on his flight, (3) the Dikṣāvibhara, the restoration of an old temple in Saligavasahikā at Cambay, where Hemacandra was consecrated to be a monk and, (4) the Jhulikavibhara, the Cradle-temple, which Kumarapala ordered to be built in Dhandhuka at the place of Hemacandra's birth.¹² Even if we do not accept all particulars in these statements as true yet they prove that Kumarapala's edifices were not confined to only Aphilvād and Devapattana. The modern tradition has also preserved reminiscences of the same. On the Satruñjaya and the Girnar there are still exhibited Kumaravibharas which however, have been much restored and contain none of the old inscriptions. In Cambay and Dhandhuka they believe they know at least the sites where Kumarapala's edifices once stood.

Despite these extensive activities in the service of the Jaina-doctrine and to the advantage of the Jainas Kumarapala did not completely forget the old cult of his family. In the *Dvyatraya* Hemacandra himself states about the restoration of the temple of Sivakedaranātha and of the Śiva Somanātha following the proclamation of the law of Protection, and also about the building of a Kumaresvara in Aphilvād, which took place at a still later time, after the construction of the Kumaravibharas in Aphilvād and in Devapattana. The reasons behind the erection of the Kumaresvara are very peculiar. Mahadeva, says Hemacandra appeared himself to Kumarapala in a dream announced to him that he was satisfied with his services and expressed his desire to reside in Aphilvād. From these facts one can conclude that Kumarapala, despite all his devotion to Hemacandra and despite his adoption of the Jaina faith, never totally denied help to the Sivaites. He might have forced them to give up their bloody sacrifices but he permitted the temple-priests and the ascetics to draw their allowances from the royal treasury. There must have been times when he again drew nearer to the Śivaita faith and worshipped Śiva as well as Jina. Such wavering and such mixing of faiths is not unusual in India and such things have happened in old times to other kings also who had attached themselves to heterodox sects, as, for example Harṣavardhana the well-known king of Thanesar and Kanauj. This latter king had paid his respects as Hinen Tsiang states to have observed with his very eyes, to the Buddhists, to the Brahmins and to the Jainas. The causes of these phenomena are sufficiently clear. At the court there were always, besides the heterodox parties, the orthodox ones whose influence over the princes remained very powerful. Certainly this must have been the case with Aphilvād, for according to the *Prabandhas*, the Jaina Vāgbhata was in no way the only minister of Kumarapala. Along with him there also was a Mantrin, Kapardin who is not said to have been a Jaina. In the same way, there appears to have been a Saiva teacher, Devahodhi by name, who is supposed to have been a spiritual adviser to Kumarapala (see pp. 39-51) even after his conversion. In the colophon of a manuscript of V S 1218 it is mentioned that Mahamātya Yaśodharāla was the first minister, probably the same-named Parmāraparty was naturally strengthened by the old habits of the king and his earlier association with Sivaita ascetics. Added to this finally, is the tendency of Indian character, that of reconciling sharp contradictions in the religious systems by conceiving and explaining

the same merely as various forms of the same fundamental truth. It has been shown above that, in the twelfth century the Brahmanical gods of Trimūrti were identified with the Jinas and that probably Hemacandra himself made use of such an identification in the beginning of his attempt at Kumārapāla's conversion to his doctrine. It was then quite natural that his convert afterwards worshipped Śiva along with Jina. We may perhaps also assume that Hemacandra fully concurred in that, for otherwise he could have hardly recorded so impartially the Śivaite temples built by his patron and pupil. However that might have been, Hemacandra would not have offered any serious opposition to Kumārapāla's Śivaite tendencies and, in order not to jeopardise all his work, he might have connived at it, rather like a clever missionary. These assumptions are strengthened by the fact that Kumārapāla is said to have been a Śivaite in the above-mentioned inscription in Devapattana in honour of Bhāva-Bṛhaspati, which was written in Valabhi-Saṃvat 850 or Vikrama-Saṃvat 1225, only 4 years after his death. Naturally there is in it no talk of the conversion of the king to Jainism. On the contrary, grants are described which he made to Bṛhaspati and other Śaivas and he is further called *Māhes'varanṛpāgrāhī*, "the leader of the kings of the Śaiva faith", in line 50. Then there were indeed cases, which gave an opportunity to the Śaiva-priests to court him as one belonging to their fold, just as there were facts which allowed the Jains to give him a by-name *Paramārthata*. A perfectly complete victory Hemacandra could not therefore attain, but he certainly succeeded as much as any other heterodox teacher has done with a royal proselyte. It is true that he could not wholly lure Kumārapāla away from Śaivism. But he succeeded in inducing him to constantly observe the most important Jaina-vows, and in exerting a great influence over the government. Gujarat did not, of course, become a Jaina-Empire in the sense that the majority of its population were converted to Jainism. A very significant spread of Jainism was already precluded by the fact that the dogmas of this faith forbade many of the most useful occupations, e. g. agriculture. But the edicts against the killing of animals, against spirituous drink, and against betting and playing at stakes were successfully enforced and thus some of the most important tenets of Jainism came to be rooted into the life of every one.

CHAPTER VIII

Hemacandra's literary works after Kumārapāla's Conversion

Even during the period of his greatest power, when the friendship with Kumārapāla claimed much of him, Hemacandra remained true to his literary aspirations. Besides the *Yogas'āstra*, already mentioned, and an exhaustive commentary thereon, he wrote, between V. S. 1216 and 1229, a collection of stories of the holy, already mentioned, entitled, *Triṣaṣṭisalākāpurusacarita*—"the Life of the sixty-three best men." The work gives in ten *Parvans* the legends of the twenty-four Jinas, the twelve Cakravartins or emperors of India, the nine Vāsudevas, the nine Baladevas and the nine Viṣṇuśiṣṇor or enemies of the nine incarnations of Viṣṇu. An appendix, the *Parisiṣṭaparvan* or *Sthavirāralicārta*, deals with the story of Daśapūrvins, the oldest teachers of the Jaina-religion from Jambūdvāmin upto Vajrasvāmin, who still knew the old canonical manuals, called the *Pūrva*. The work is written almost wholly in heroic metre and is called by the author a *Mahākāvya* or great epic. Its extent is very great, so great that it justifies in a certain degree its proud claim of comparison with the *Mahābhārata*, as hinted by the division into *Parvans*. According to Jinamandana, it contains 35,000 *Anuṣṭubh śloka*s.¹ Its composition falls later than that of the *Yogas'āstra*, for it is not quoted in the Commentary on the latter. On the other hand, in the notes on III, 131 the story of the teacher Sthūlabhadra is related in almost identical terms as in the *Parisiṣṭaparvan* VIII, 2-197 and IX, 55-111a. Only the introductory verses are different and here and there some different readings are found which, however, seldom make any difference in sense. It is therefore evident that the particular passages from the commentary on the *Yogas'āstra* have been taken over in the *Parisiṣṭaparvan*. On the other hand, the *Triṣaṣṭisalākāpurusacarita* was written earlier than the *Dvayāś'rayalārya* or, at least, earlier than the last five *sargas* of the latter, if we believe Nerutunga's statement that this poem originally glorified only the victories of Jayasimha-Siddharāja, and if we accept that the concluding portion was a later addition (p. 19). The *Dvayāś'rayalārya* describes the story of Kumārapāla a little further than does the *Mahāviracarita*. For, it mentions, as already shown on p. 33, the magnificent temple of Pārśvanātha at Devapattana. The *Mahāviracarita* is silent as to this one but it describes in minute details the circumstances which caused the somewhat earlier building of the Kumāravihāra in Anahilvād. Further, the Sanskrit *Dvayāś'raya* was followed by

the Prakrit *Dvayāśraya* or *Kumaravālacariya*, a very small work entirely dedicated to Kumārapāla and highly praising his piety and devotion to the Jina but at the same time illustrating the rules of the Prakrit-Grammar.⁵⁰ The commentary on the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* was probably the last of the scholarly works of this last period. The fact that in this commentary both the *Yogasūtra* and the *Triṣaṣṭīśālikāpūrusacarita* are cited, proves not only that it belongs to the period after V. S. 1216 but also that it was written during the last years of the author's life. That this was his last work is also proved by another fact. Closely related with the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*, the *Lexicon of Synonyms*, is the *Anekārthakoṣa*, that of the Homonyms, which supplements the former.⁵¹ Besides, there also exists a commentary on this, the *Anekārthakairavākarakauṇḍi*. This is, however, not the work of Hemacandra himself, but of his pupil Mahendra who wrote it in his master's name after the death of the latter. It is said in the *Prasasti* given at the end of this work:⁵²

(1) "By the renowned Mahendrasūri, the ever truly devoted pupil of the renowned Hemasūri, is this commentary written in the name of his (master)."

(2) "Where is to be found in an unlucky fellow like me such skill in exposition (as is required) for the hook of the well-known master Hemacandra, one with the treasures of perfection (*samyaktra*) and knowledge, endowed with endless advantages? If, nevertheless, I have expounded it, it is no wonder; for I repeat the (oral) explanations of him (that man) who lives constantly in my heart."

The concluding words indicate that at the time when Mahendra wrote, Hemacandra was dead and that Mahendra, out of piety for the deceased, wrote down his oral explanations and published them in his name. It also appears that Hemacandra might have thought of himself commenting on the second part of his *Koṣa*, but before he could carry out his plan, he was overpowered by death. It may therefore be supposed that the commentary on the first part was completed just before the death. It is to be repeated that (see page 37) also the *Śeṣākhya Nāmamālā* can possibly belong to this last period, if this work was originally included in the commentary on the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*. This statement may be corroborated by similar occurrences in the commentary on the *Yogasūtra* which contains metrical supplements to the text (Note 80). Certainty about this point can, however, be arrived at only if the old palm-leaf MSS. of the commentary on the *Koṣa* be carefully investigated. As regards the date of the work about Jaina dialectics mentioned as *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā* in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, but as *Syādvādamasūtri* in the MSS.,⁵³ I can say nothing definite. As, however, it is not mentioned in the commentary on the *Yogasūtra*, it also belongs, perhaps, to the works of the period of V. S. 1216-1229. With this, the list of Hemacandra's works is exhausted. The author of the *Prabhāvakacaritra* says, in fact, "simple-minded people like him" (Note 74) do not know all the works of the great master, and Rājasekhara boldly believes that Hemacandra wrote 30,000,000 slokas. Though this statement is often repeated in the *Paṭṭāvalis* or *Gurūtālis*, it is obviously an absurd exaggeration. As yet there has been found no reason to ascribe more books to Hemacandra than the ones mentioned here, and these contain about 100,000 slokas. In this respect, it is particularly important to

More interesting than these probably throughout apocryphal proofs of Hemacandra's dexterity in poetry, is a legend which is to show how cleverly he treated the Brahmo priests who wanted to compel the king to break his vow. Rajasekhara, who is the earliest to tell us this legend, describes it as follows "A short time after Kumrapāla had enforced the protection of living animals, there began the bright half of the month Āśvina Thereupon, the priests of Kuntēsvari and of other goddesses proclaimed to the king 'Lord, on the seventh day the king must, according to the custom of his ancestors, offer to the goddesses seven hundred goats and seven buffalos. On the eighth day eight hundred goats and eight buffalos and on the ninth day nine hundred goats and nine buffalos' After the king had heard that, he went to Hemacandra and informed him of the matter The great teacher whispered something in his ears The king then arose and promised to pay the priests what was their due By night the animals were led into the temple of the goddess, the doors were carefully locked and trustworthy Rajputs were posted as guards The next morning, the king arrived and ordered to open the doors of the temple In the middle they saw the animals lying down and chewing the cud, refreshed by the repose in the wind-sheltered place Thereupon said the king Priests, these animals I had offered to the goddesses If they had any liking for the animals, they could have consumed them The animals, however, are quite safe Apparently, therefore the goddesses have no liking for flesh But you love it Hence keep absolute quiet I will not permit the killing of living animals' The Priests hung their heads down The goats were released The king, however, had the food-offering brought to the goddesses worth the value of the goats'

The story, which Jinamandana relates in a slightly shorter form, reminds us in a certain way of the Biblical story of Elias and the priests of Baal However, one can hardly take it as an adaptation of the latter It probably arose independently. Even if this story be an invention it is certainly a good invention so as much as it properly describes the difficulties which Kumrapāla had to face upon his conversion, and the methods of his spiritual counsel to remove them from his path It is noteworthy that according to this legend the cult of Kuntēsvari was not abolished but was transformed from a bloody to a bloodless cult

Two other stories by Merutunga show how Hemacandra behaved towards his enemies The first one tells us that the mighty Śiva-priest Brhaspati once occasioned some inconvenience regarding the Kumaravihara in Deripattana Immediately he lost his job because of Hemacandra's disfavour Thereupon he came to Anhilvād, learnt the *Śodhas tāyala* and served the Jaina-mook An entreaty-verse pacified the latter at last and Brhaspati was again appointed as the guardian of the Śaiva-fundations Just as harsh but also equally as forgiving, Hemacandra showed himself towards an old enemy, Vāmadeva or Vāmarasī, who had been his rival during Jayasimha's reign and who chafed at him with a malicious satirical verse when Hemacandra gaoed his high position As a punishment he opprobriously ordered his servants to drive Vāmarasī out of his house with their lance-shafts He also sentenced him to the *as'āstra-vadhā* "the punishment of a bloodless death," which consisted of the withdrawal of his *utthi*, his salary from the royal treasury Vāmarasī then subsisted on scattered grains which he gleaned, and stood often

before the school of his enemy. As Ānā and other princes were one day learning the *Yogasāstra* there, Vāmarāsi praised this work in a verse "in all sincerity." Hemacandra was therefore reconciled and granted him a *ṛtī*, double as large as the earlier one had been." The story about Brhaspati probably presents the relationship of this man to Hemacandra in a more proper light than the legend, given above (p. 29), according to which the Śaiva monk and the Jaina monk were good friends.

By far the greatest number of the legends given in the *Prabandhas* describes, however, Hemacandra's supernatural powers, his gift of prophecy, his knowledge of the remotest past, his hold over evil spirits and the Brahmanic deities hostile to Jainism. Already in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*, a prophecy of Hemacandra's is mentioned, which was literally fulfilled. The king of Kalyāṇa-kateka, it is said, who had received information from his spies that Kumārapāla had become a Jaina and was therefore powerless, gathered a big army with a view to conquering Gujarat. Full of anxiety, Kumārapāla went to Hemacandra and inquired whether he would be defeated by this enemy. Hemacandra consoled him by saying that the protecting deities of the Jaina-doctrine were keeping watch over Gujarat, and that the enemy would die on the seventh day. In reality, the spies brought Kumārapāla soon afterwards the news that the prophecy had come true. Both Merutuṅga and Jinamandana also have this story. In their version the hostile king is, however, Karna, the ruler of Dāhala or Tivar in the Central Provinces. They also state how he died, and describe that he was asleep on his elephant during a nocturnal march, when his golden necklace got caught in a banyan tree, and he was strangled to death. Karna of Dāhala ruled about hundred years before Kumārapāla and was, as Merutuṅga rightly points out elsewhere, a contemporary of Bhīmadēva I."

A second proof of his prophetic gift, according to Merutuṅga, Hemacandra furnished when he described his story of a previous birth to the king. Rājasekhara and Jinamandana give the same *in extenso* and add thereto that Hemacandra himself did not describe it but that he made Vidyādevīs reveal themselves in Siddhapura for the purpose. The king came to know thereby the cause of his enmity with Jayasimha and was, as Jinamandana says, so very much surprised at the wisdom of his teacher that he conferred upon him the title of *Kalikālasarvajña*, "the omniscient of the *Kali-yuga*." It is not at all improbable that Hemacandra claimed to have told the king about his fate in the previous life, as the Jaina-monks have often done so in similar circumstances. It is another question whether the version before us really reflects the *Pūrvacaryānta* described by Hemacandra.

Absolutely absurd but characteristic of the gradual development of the legends is the third story related by Jinamandana, attributing to Hemacandra the gift of clairvoyance. Once, so the story goes, Hemacandra was sitting with the king and the Śaiva-ascetic Devabodhi and was explaining the holy scriptures. Suddenly he stopped and screamed a cry of woe. Devabodhi rubbed his hands and said: "That does not matter a bit!" Then the devotional lesson was resumed. When Hemacandra had finished it, Kumārapāla asked him what had been the matter with him and Devabodhi. Thereupon the monk replied: "O King, I saw that in the temple of Caodraprabha io Devapattana

a rat dragged away the wick of a lamp and consequently a conflagration broke out. Devabodhi extinguished it when he rubbed his hands." Kumārāpāla sent, thereupon, messengers to Devapattana and found that Hemacandra's statement had been correct.¹⁰⁰

The *Prabhāvalacaritra* also supplies us with an instance of Hemacandra's magic powers. It relates, that Āmrābhata came into conflict with Sindhavi Devi and Yoginis as he had the Temple of Savrata in Broach restored. He was consequently punished with illness by them. His mother invoked the help of Hemacandra who went to Broach with his pupil Yaśāscandra, made the Devi surrender by magic powers, and healed Āmrābhata. Slightly different recensions of this anecdote are found in Merutunga and in Jinamandana.¹⁰¹

Both these latter as well as Rijasekhara also relate that Hemacandra cured Kumārāpāla of leprosy. According to Merutunga, this disease attacked the king as a result of a curse which the pious mother of the king Lakṣa of Kach had given to the successors of Mūlarāja, the conqueror of her son. By the power of his *Yoga*, Hemacandra cured the king. According to Rijasekhara, Kuntēsvari Devi, the family goddess of the Caulukyās, took revenge for the prohibition of her sacrifices (p. 52) by revealing herself to Kumārāpāla and striking him on the head with the trident. As a result, he became leprosy. He called his minister Udayana to him and told him his tale of woe. On Udayana's advice, Hemacandra was requested to help, who cured the disease with the water consecrated with magical incantations. Jinamandana gives enlarged recensions of both the stories and makes the miracle doubly worked.¹⁰²

Still more phantastic are the two stories which are related by Jinamandana alone. The first of them is: Kumārāpāla had taken a pledge not to quit his capital during the rainy season, in order to fulfil the sixth vow of the Jains. Meanwhile, he received information from his spies that the Śaka Prince of Garjana, that is, the Muhammedan Sultan of Gazni, had made preparations to wage a war against Gujarat precisely during that rainy season. Kumārāpāla was greatly perplexed. If he wanted to keep his vow, he could not defend his land. If, on the other hand, he would fulfil his royal obligations, he must become untrue to the Jain faith. In this dilemma he approached Hemacandra who reassured him at once and promised help. Hemacandra then sat down in the posture of 'lotus-seat' (*padmāsana*) and gave himself up into deep meditation. After a while, there came a palanquin flying through the air, in which lay a sleeping man. This sleeper was the Prince of Garjana whom Hemacandra had dragged in there by the power of his *Yoga*-magic. He was released only after he had promised to preserve peace with Gujarat and to command in his kingdom the protection of all living beings during six months. The second story ascribes a still greater power to Hemacandra. Once he had a quarrel with Devabodhi as to whether it was a full-moon day or a new-moon day. He himself had voted for the former which was, however, wrong; he was therefore scoffed at by Devabodhi. Despite this, Hemacandra declared that he had not been wrong but asserted that the evening would prove the correctness of his view. When the sun set in, Kumārāpāla with Devabodhi and his barons climbed on the top-room of his palace in order to see if the moon would rise and as a matter of precaution he also sent messengers

to the east on a swift dromedary. The full moon *did* really rise in the east, shone forth the whole night and the next morning set in the west! The royal messengers who had ridden far into the land, told the same story on their return. It was therefore no illusion that might have deceived the king's eyes, but a real miracle that Hemacandra worked with the help of a ministering godling who had given him a *siddhacakra*.¹⁰³

The number of the legends of the second group is much smaller and almost all of them are met with already in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*. The first story, which is to show the attachment of the king to Hemacandra, relates about an amazing transformation of the ordinary palm trees of the royal garden into Śrītāla-trees. Once, it has been said, on account of copying the numerous works of Hemacandra, the palm-leaves were exhausted and there was no hope of getting a new stock imported from abroad. Kumārapāla was very much distressed at the thought of his teacher's work being interrupted. He went into his garden where many ordinary palm trees stood, worshipped them with fragrant substances and flowers, placed round their trunks golden wreaths adorned with pearls and rubies and prayed that they might be transformed into Śrītāla-trees. The next morning the gardeners announced that the king's wish had been fulfilled. The messengers who brought the happy news were richly rewarded, and the scribes worked further with greater zeal. This fable is quite similarly related by Jinamaṇḍana. He only commits an anachronism when he assumes that the scribes would have managed with paper which, however, the king did not think proper. As the close scrutiny of the old Jaina-Libraries has brought out, the use of paper was only introduced to Gujarat one hundred and twenty years later after the conquest of the land by the Muhammadans.¹⁰⁴

A second and still greater proof of his devotion was furnished by Kumārapāla to his teacher by presenting his empire to Hemacandra. According to the *Prabhāvakacaritra* this happened on the occasion of explaining a Gāthā which makes complete surrender a duty to the believer. Hemacandra refused, it is said, to accept the gift by arguing that as an ascetic he must be free from all passions and from all desires. In spite of it, the king did not want to give in. Thereupon the minister intervened and proposed that Kumārapāla should remain the king but should fulfil the royal duties only with the approval of his *Guru*. This solution was accepted and Hemacandra wrote the *Yogasāstra* with a view to instructing Kumārapāla as to how he should, as a believing king, behave himself.¹⁰⁵

Very many particular but probably apocryphal accounts about Kumārapāla's manifestations of his faith in the Jīne are given by Jinamaṇḍana. There, he relates that the king had, after his conversion, given away to the Brāhmins all the images of Mahēśvara and other gods which his forefathers had worshipped, and that he only tolerated the statues of the Jinas in his palace.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, in his long report of the taking of the twelve vows in the presence of Hemacandra, he describes in detail how the king fulfilled each of them and what *Birudas* or 'titles of honour' he received for the same. Amongst the laws, which the observance of the Jaina precepts is said to have caused, the following deserve special mention. In order to fulfil the seventh vow, which forbids unnecessary force and occupations connected therewith, the king renounced the

revenues which he received from charcoal burning, from the forest, from the tax on bullock-carts kept for hire etc, and he ordered to destroy the register about these things. The contents of the twelfth vow made him remit taxes to the amount of 12 lacs which the "faithful (*s'raddhas*) paid. For the same reason, he granted money to needy Jains and had houses (*satragaras*) built where food was distributed to beggars. As regards his title of honour, Hemacandra called him *Saranagatatula* "Protector of the supplicants for help, for his fulfilment of the first vow, *Yudhishira* for the fulfilment of the second and *Brahmaris* for that of the fourth."

Moreover, we find in all the *Prabandhas* the statement that Kumarapāla undertook one or several pilgrimages to the Jaina shrines of Gujarat in company with Hemacandra. According to the *Prabhavalacarita*, only one took place quite at the end of his reign. On this one pilgrimage he visited Satrunjaya and Girnar. He did not, however, mount the latter hill himself, but worshipped Neminatha at the foot of it. He commissioned his minister Vagbhata to construct a better road up the rock. Merutunga's *Tirthayatraprabandha* gives a very similar account. It connects with it, however, the anecdote of the planned attack by the King Dahala and makes Kumarapāla, as the leader of the Jaina congregation (*Samghadhipati*), enter Satrunjaya via Dhandhoka. In the first-named city, so it is said, the Cradle-vihara (p. 46) was built on this occasion. Merutunga also appears to place the pilgrimage at the end of Kumarapāla's reign. Rājasekhara, on the other hand speaks of two pilgrimages: one to Kathiavād and the other to Stambhapura or Cambay, which latter city the king is said to have presented to Jina Parśvanatha. Finally, Jinamaydana agrees with Merutunga, but declares in his general survey of Kumarapāla's work that the King consecrated himself by seven pilgrimages and that on the occasion of the first one, he worshipped the Jina with nine jewels which were worth nine lacs. Now even if there be no confirmation of these statements in documents of Kumarapāla's time, one may nevertheless believe the *Prabandhas* when they say that the king actually visited Satrunjaya and Girnar towards the end of his reign. The silence of the *Dvaya-rayakavya* and of the *Mahavivacarita* on this point has no great significance, for both these works were composed as shown above some time before the end of Kumarapāla's reign. On the other hand, the rare complete agreement of both the oldest *Prabandhas* is a weighty argument in favour of the general correctness of their statement, and a still more weighty one for the internal probability of the same. It is precisely in their last years that the Indian princes make pilgrimages their habit and it is easy to understand that Kumarapāla, who had himself built shrines in various localities of the peninsula of Kathiavād felt it incumbent on him to pay a visit to them. On the contrary, it is extremely questionable whether the details of this pilgrimage are correctly described. For, one can hardly believe that if Kumarapāla visited Girnar he should have left unvisited Devipattana which is not very far from Girnar and where his temples of Parśvanatha and Somanatha stood. The statements about his visit to Cambay and about the seven pilgrimages can have, of course, little claim to be credible as they are to be found only in later works.

As to Hemacandra's end, the *Prabhataacarita* gives no details. It only says that he died in Vikrama-Samvat 1229. Merutunga gives some more details

According to his account, Hemacandra predicted that he would die at the end of his 84th year, and when he had reached that age, he began the last fast, customary among the Jaina ceremonies, which leads the monk surely to Nirvāṇa. Before his death, he prophesied to his friend, who was lamenting for him, that he (his friend) too would meet his end after six months, and admonished him, being childless, to perform the last rites for himself whilst he was still alive. After he had spoken thus, "he released the breath of life through the tenth opening of the body." Kumārapāla had his corpse burned and, as he considered the ashes as sacred, made a sign on his forehead with the same. All the nobles of the kingdom and the citizens of Anhilvād followed his example. Merutuṅga adds that even now the Hemakhaṇḍa at Anhilvād is famous for that reason. It is further said that Kumārapāla passed the rest of his life in deep sorrow and after a reign of 31 years died, on the predicted day, "the death of Meditation." The latter form of expression appears to indicate that he, too, chose, by fast, the death of the wise man.

Jinamanḍana repeats Merutuṅga's account in so far as it concerns Hemacandra; but he adds a few details as regards his last years. He states that these were embittered by a schism amongst his pupils. Kumārapāla, being childless and an aged man, was distressed as to the selection of a successor and was in doubt whether to appoint Ajayapāla, his brother's son who had the first claim according to the custom, or the son of his daughter, Pratāpamalla, as his heir. Hemacandra had declared himself in favour of the latter, for he was beloved by the people and firm in faith, whereas Ajayapāla was inclined to evil passions, favoured the Brahmins and would surely put aside the laws made by his uncle. In spite of this, Bilacandra is said to have formed an intimate friendship with Ajayapāla against the wish of his teacher and against the interests of his faith. Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, on the other hand, remained true to their teacher. Jinamanḍana describes Kumārapāla's end somewhat differently from Merutuṅga: According to his account, Kumārapāla was poisoned by Ajayapāla after the former had chosen Pratāpamalla as his successor, following Hemacandra's advice. When Kumārapāla felt the effect of the poison, he sent for a shell in his treasury, which could chase away poison. Ajayapāla had already had this removed. When the king heard this, he prepared for death according to Jaina rites and died, after having vowed to decline all food. Ajayapāla then ascended the throne, being supported by the Brahmin party.¹⁷

From these accounts we can take with certainty only this much that Hemacandra died in V. S. 1229 shortly before Kumārapāla. The assertion that during the last years of his life he became involved in the intrigues regarding the successor to the throne and that he attempted to exclude the rightful heir in the interests of the Jaina faith is, *ipso facto*, not improbable. In favour of this assertion, it may be argued that, according to all the sources there was a strong reaction against Jainism after his death, and that Hemacandra's and Kumārapāla's old friends, Rāmacandra and Āmrabhata (Udayana's son) were particularly persecuted by the new king. Similarly, the story of Pratāpamalla's being selected as successor to the throne and of Kumārapāla's being poisoned is by no means incredible. However, before we declare it to be historical with any certainty, it will be necessary to have the story confirmed by older and more reliable sources than Jinamanḍana's compilation.

NOTES

1. The life of Hemacandra forms the XXII and last *Sṛga* of the *Pūrvapīcaritracohanagiri* or *Prabhātakacaritra*, and a few notes about him also occur in the XXI *Sṛga*. This work, a continuation of Hemacandra's *Pañcīśāparvan* to the *Triśaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacaritra*, was compiled by Prabhācandrasūri, Candraprabha's successor, and was corrected by Pradyumnasūri, the pupil of Kāṣkaprabhasūri, who on his part was a pupil of the grammarian Devānanda. Verse 16 of the Introduction is as follows:

श्रीदेवानन्दशैशवीकनकमणिच्यराद् ।
श्रीप्रद्युम्नमुनीपादन्यस्यास् विमुक्तिहृद् ॥

"Victory to the lord Śrī Pradyumna who completely purified this work (from errors)—he, the king among the pupils of Śrī Kāṣkaprabha, the pupil of Śrī Devānanda!"

Quite the same has been said in the verses which stand at the end of each of the *Sṛgas*. At the end of the XXII *Sṛga*, the following verse occurs:

श्रीचंद्रमसुरिषट्सतीहंसप्रमः श्रीप्रम-
चंद्रः सुरितेन चेतसि कृते श्रीरामलक्ष्मीतुवा ।
श्रीसूर्यचरित्रोद्दगगिरी श्रीहेमचंद्रः प्राप्य[श्रीहेमचंद्रमनोः]
श्रीप्रद्युम्नमुनीदुना विरादितः शृंगो द्विकद्विमनः[ः] ॥

"On the throne of Śrī-Candraprabhasūri (there sits), like a swan in a lake, Śrī Prabhācandra. In the biography of the well-known *Rṣis* of old—a biography which is comparable to the Rohana mountain—conceived by this (Prabhācandra) son of Śrī Rāma and Lakṣmī, (thus ends) the twenty second peak (*Sṛga*) in the form of biographical sketch of Śrī Hemacandra, which is purified by Śrī-Pradyumna, the moon among the monks."

Several other verses, too, at the end of *Sṛgas* I, V, VII, XI, XIII, XV, XVII, XIX and XXI are dedicated to the praise of Pradyumna. The third from the last of these is important, as it contains a statement which enables us to determine Pradyumna's time at least approximately. This verse says:

श्रीदेवानंदसूरिर्दिवत् मुदमसौ हयनायेन ईश-
दुच्छ्रामाचहेतोर्विहितमभिनवं सिद्धसातस्तत्रात्म[न्] ।

दास्य शास्त्र यदीयान्वयिन्नरुपरिस्वानरुप्युद्धम
श्रीमान्मुमुक्षुरपि सद्यसि गिर न यदर्थं प्रवृत्ता ॥

May joy be caused to you by Sūri Śrī Devananda through whom for the sake of the ignorant a new grammar called *Siddha Sarasvatī* was written—taken from the manual of Hemacandra—and by the successor of his pupil Kanakaprabha namely Śrī Pradyumnasūri whom we may compare to a tree of paradise, he the purifier of word forms and of the meaning purifies our speech”

From this verse of the second half of which I have merely given the general sense without paying attention to the play of words we see that Devananda wrote a manual of grammar entitled *Siddha Sarasvatī*, which was an extract from Hemacandra's works. As Hemacandra calls his grammar *Siddha Sarasvatī* and as this title means the manual written by Hemacandra in honour of King Jayasinha Siddharāja, it seems obvious that we may interpret the name of Devananda's work in a similar way and explain it by the *Sarasvatī* (i.e. the work completed by the grace of the goddess Sarasvatī) written in honour of King Siddharāja. If this explanation be correct—for we must confess that another explanation is by all means possible then Devananda would have been a contemporary of Hemacandra's and would have written under Jayasinha Siddharāja (who died Vikrama Samvat 1199, Kartika sudi 3 or 1142/3 A.D.). In that case the literary activity of Pradyumna Sūri the pupil of his pupil would fall within the first and second half of the 13th Century approximately. However, we are saved from the necessity of building upon so uncertain a foundation by some very interesting informations from the *Prasasti* of the Cambay manuscript of Balacandra's *Vivekanandagāthikā* in Dr Peterson's *First Report* App. I pp. 191-199 which gives a quite certain date for the activity of the above named Pradyumnasūri. The first *Prasasti* (i.e. pp. 191-193) a song in praise of the author of the *Vivekanandagāthā* and of the author of the Commentary relates the following: The poet Āśada born of the Bhīllamalavamsa (i.e. a Śrinidhi Vāṇa) and a son of Katuka-rāja who for his services in expounding Kaṇḍiśa's *Alaghadūta* received the title *Kaṇḍiśa's raṅga*, the ornament of the assembly of poets from the court scholars (*rajaśabdhāḥ*) had two sons: Rājāśa Balasarasvatī and Jaitrasimha by his wife Jaitaladevī. When the first one died he mourned deeply. Awakened by a Sūri named Abhayadeva he wrote the *Vivekanandagāthā* in V.S. 1263 (Peterson *First Report* App. I p. 56) or 1211 12 A.D. (verse 12). His second son Jaitrasimha later induced the Gaṇin Balacandra to write a commentary on his father's work (verse 13). The latter called in the assistance of three men namely Vyāsaśaśa-sūri from Nageṇḍiagaccha, Padmasūri from Bhāḍagaccha (verse 14) and Pradyumnasūri who was the pupil of Kanakaprabhasūri—the moon which adorned the heaven of Devananda's school. We find here the same order: Devananda, Kanakaprabha and Pradyumna as in the *Prabhāvakāśastrī* and it is therefore certain that the corrector of the last-named was Balacandra's assistant. The last verse of the 2nd *Prasasti*, a song in praise of the noble donor of the Cambay MS (i.e. p. 199 verse 33) teaches us that the MS was completed on the 8th day of the dark half of the month Kārtika in the year 1322 (of the Vikrama-era) on a Monday or according to Dr. Schram's calculation on the 2nd November 1265 which actually was a Monday. Immediately afterwards there is the announcement that this *Prasasti* was corrected by the venerable Śrī Pradyumnasūri (*prasastih samaptaḥ sukham astiḥ purāṇa-vi-Pradyumnasūriḥ prasastih samadhitaiḥ*). This has gained for us a definite date for Pradyumna's activity. It may be added moreover that he also helped with the production of a third work of which we may assert with great probability that it belongs to the middle of the 13th century at the latest. Devāsūri says in the Introduction to his *Santīnāthacaritā* (Peterson *First Report* 1882-83 p. 60 App. pp. 4-6) that his poem is a revision of a Prakrit work of the same name by Devacandra-sūri (verse 13). Then he praises the pupil of the latter Hemacandra who converted a king [Kumara-pāla] (Verses 14-15). Then (verse 16) he pays his homage to Devananda, an honor of the Kanakaprabha. Devananda's pupil corrected his work. Verse 17 is so similar to the above-quoted verse of the *Prabhāvakāśastrī* XVII 399 that it is safe to ascribe it to the same author Pradyumnasūri. The age of the *Santīnāthacaritā* is approximately determined by the fact that the Cambay MS of the

same was written in the Samvat 1 e in all probability Vikrama Samvat 1338 or 1282 83 A. D. The era cannot be determined in this case with absolute certainty as no details are available. The fact that the Jains almost always use the Vikrama era is a point in favour of the theory that this era is meant.

These results of the investigation of Pradyumna's period allow us to assert safely that the *Prabhuvalacārīya* belongs to the 13th century and make it probable that the date of its compilation is not far removed from 1250 A. D. It is therefore the oldest source for the life of Hemacandra. It is all the more essential to emphasize this and to explain it fully as my honoured friend Rao Bahadur S. P. Pandit places this work at a much later period. He opines in his Introduction to the Gaudarāho p. CLIX that it was written after Rajasekhara's *Prabandhaloka* (see Note 3) and that Rajasekhara is mentioned in the *Prabhuvalacārīya* VI 1. However the verse in question in its correct form reads —

वपुषष्टिं श्रिये श्रीमान्पद्मवत्तयादये ।
खेति च गतायते राजेधरविर्तुष ॥ १ ॥

The MS which is available to me which like No 12 of the Deccan College Collection of 1879/80 was made after the copy in Hathang's Bhandar at Ahmadabad and is full of errors gives *gatayatam rajayara*. The Deccan College MS has not these two errors but then at the end we read instead of *budhai* the nonsensical reading *buda* for which R. B. Pandit substitutes *muda*. This correction is not only unnecessary but also spoils the sense. The translation of the verse is —

(May) the illustrious Bappabhatti (lead us) to prosperity in whose life the wise (*budha*) Rajesarakavi going and coming played (a rôle) like the planet Mercury (*budha*) in the firmament.

Rajesarakavi means the same as Vajrapataya and therefore serves to designate the author of the *Gaudarāho* who according to the Jains long repeatedly came into contact with Bappabhatti. He is called *budha* (wise) and this word which is also a name of the planet Mercury leads to the further comparison of the life of Bappabhatti with the firmament. The latter is very popular with Jain poets and seemed suitable to the author as he hints that the life of the teacher was pure as the firmament to which as the Indians say no dirt adheres. Rao Bahadur Pandit's hypothesis that this verse says that Bappabhatti's life-story is borrowed from the *Prabandhaloka* is therefore wrong. An exact comparison of the date in the *Prabhuvalacārīya* with those of the *Prabandhaloka* would have shown clearly that the account of the latter is based upon the former. Another argument brought forward by R. B. Pandit for the late date of the *Prabhuvalacārīya* is just as unsound. He says loc cit p. CLIII —

The author of this work lived long after Hemacandra (A. D. 1030-1174) because in addition to writing a story of the latter's life in his work he speaks of him as having written *long ago* (*pura* VI 11) certain works on the lives of some of the men about whom he writes himself.

This expression contains many errors. The passage which R. B. Pandit has in his mind does not occur in the *Pr. Car.* VI 11 but in I 11 in the Introduction to the work. It also does not affirm that the author bases himself upon Hemacandra's works but that he carries further the life-story of the Jain teachers which was begun by Hemacandra in the *Triśaṣṭiśālokapurīṣacārīya*. There in the *Parasūtoparvan* the narrative breaks off with the life of Vajrasvāmin. The verses in question read in my MS as follows

कले युगप्रदानश्रीदेमचन्द्र [ह]यमु युग ।
श्रीराजकाव्या यत् [वि]श्वं प्रत्यदीनं वृषदोषहृ ॥ ११ ॥
युववेयदिना वर्णा दार्ढ्यवृत्तामपि ।
भावजसामिदृशं च श्रीराजानि न्ययत् स ॥ १२ ॥

7. In the prose introduction directly after the fifth verse of the *Mangala*, p 2, ll 3 ff, the following piece is given

इह किल दिव्येण विनीतविनयेन शुद्धजलविषादगमस्य क्रियापरस्य गुणे समीपे विधिना सर्वमभ्येतव्यम् । ततो
मन्योचक्राय देवता कुसविनाशिनी विलास्य । तद्विधिवाचम् । अस्त्रलितममिलितमहीनाक्षरं सुम् । अग्रामलितमद्भुतार्थः
कथं । वायुसेन परितः सम्येषु दत्तद्विना यावदधीवबोधं वक्तव्यम् । वस्तु प्रायेण चरितं । प्रवर्धेयं कार्यम् । तत्र श्रीनृपमादि-
वर्धमानान्ताता चक्रयादीना राज्ञां ऋषीणां धार्मरक्षितानां धृतादि चरितान्युच्यन्ते । तत्प्रशास्त्रकालक्षणा[गत]ानां तु वराणां धृतानि
प्रवक्ष्या इति ॥

8 *Prabandhacintāmanā* p 1

श्रीगुणचन्द्रगोश प्रबन्धचिन्तामणिं नव प्रबन्धम् ।
भारतमेवमिदं प्रथमादौर्न निर्मितवान् ॥ ५ ॥
मृदा क्षुत्तवाप्त कथा. पुराणा
श्रीणन्ति चेतसि तथा युज्याताम् ।
वृष्टैर्दाससप्ततरीं प्रबन्ध-
चिन्तामणियन्मह तनोमि ॥ ६ ॥
गुपे प्रवक्ष्या स्वधियोन्वयाना
भवन्त्यवश्य यदि भिन्नभावा ।
प्रव्ये तथाप्यत्र मुसंभवा-
रहे न चरां चतुर्विधिया ॥ ७ ॥

9 See *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 9 where the town is called "a firm stage of might (of the faith)", and Note 16 Merutunga (see Note 15) adds that the town lies in the Ardhastama district. The name Ardhastama refers probably, like many similar ones, to the number of localities belonging to the district and signifies 'containing twelve villages or towns'. The *Moṭherārdhastama* is mentioned in the grant of land of Mularaja, *Indoan Antiquary*, vol. VI, p 192. As regards the modern town Dhandhukā, see Sir W W Hunter, *Imperial Gazetteer*, sub voce, and *Bombay Gazetteer*, vol IV, p 334

10 The year of birth is given by Jinamandana and in *Prabh. Car.* XXII, 852 (see below Note 14), compare also Note 16. In future I shall only give the Vikrama years, because the transmutation into the Christian years cannot generally be effected with certainty

11. The name of the father is *Gācāh* in the *Prabhāvakacaritra*; in *Rājasekhara* it is always, and in *Jinamandana* sometimes, *Gācāh*. The name of the mother is written *Pāhina* by Merutunga and *Rājasekhara*. The *Simodh* Vāṇīs are numerous even to-day. There are also numerous Brahmins who call themselves after the same place *Simodh*. (*Journ. D. Br. R. A. S.* Vol X, pp 109 110) The name of both is derived from the ancient town *Moṭherā*, south of *Anhilvād*, see Mr. K. Forbes, *Ras Mala* p. 80

12. The MSS. have also sometimes *Cangadeva*. Merutunga (see Note 15) says that *Pāhina* belonged to the *Camundagotra*, and that her son's name therefore began with *cā* *Cānga* or *Canga* may, however, be connected with the *Desī* word *cangam*, *Sindhu canga*, 'good', and *Marāṭhi, cāngalā*, 'good'.

13. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 13

सा श्रीचूडामणिचिन्तामणिं स्वदेव्यदैकत ।
दक्षं निगुह्नां च मयया...देवतः ॥ १३ ॥
च[चतु]र्दशपञ्चसरं च उग्राले मण्डितो गुपे ।
मृगप्रीतिप्रीतिदेवचन्द्रमुनीचरः ॥ १४ ॥

आच[च]रयो पाहिनी प्रायः स्वमतम्बमसूचिगम् ।
 तस्युः स तदर्थं च [च] साधय[र]ष्टे जगौ गुर[ः] ॥ १५ ॥
 सैनशासनप्रायोविहीत्युक्तः संमयी सुतः ।
 ते च स्ते[स्ते]वृद्धो यस्य देवा अपि सुवृत्तवः ॥ १६ ॥
 श्रीवीररागविभी[विम्बा]नां प्रतिष्ठानोद्द दधी ।.....
 तस्याय पञ्चमे वर्षे वर्षीयस इवाभवत् ।
 मतिः सहस्रसुखाविधौ विपुलितैस्तः ॥ २५ ॥
 अत्य[न्य]दा मोहवैतान्तः प्रभूणां चैत्यवदनम् ।
 दुर्गतां पाहिनी प्रायत् म[स]पुना तत्र पुण्यम् ॥ २६ ॥
 सा घ[च] प्रादेशिष्यं दत्ता यावत्कुर्वन् स्तुतिं गिते ।
 चन्द्रदेवो निपचायां तावति[न्य]विभी[विम्बा]नां धिमादुः ॥ गुरोः ॥ २७ ॥
 सारति रं महास्रमं यं तद्दालोकापिप्यति[लेकवसति] ।
 तस्याभिज्ञानानमिशस्य स्वयं पुत्रेण ते कृतम् ॥ २८ ॥
 हस्तुत्तवा गुरभिः पुत्रः सधनदेन नन्दनः [संपानन्दविषयनः] ।
 नलपृष्ठ इवाप्रापि स जनन्या[ः] समीपतः ॥ २९ ॥
 सा ग्राह प्राप्यतामस्य पिना युक्तमिदं ननु ।
 ते तदीयातनुताया भीता किमपि नाम्यपु ॥ ३० ॥
 अलङ्कृतवाद् गुरोर्वाप[ः]माचारस्थितया तया ।
 दूनयापि सुप्रेहादाप्यत स्थ[स्ते]मसंस्थिते ॥ ३१ ॥
 एमादाय सन्मद[ः]यं जम्मु श्रीगार्धमन्दिरे ।
 माये सितपदुद्दयां ग्राह्ये धि[ः]यै शान्ते[ने]दिने ॥ ३२ ॥
 [धि]न्ये तथाष्टमे धर्मस्थिते चन्द्रे वृषोपये ।
 एते वृक्षतौ (?) स्थितयो [ः] सूर्योमायो ॥ ३३ ॥
 श्रीमातुदयनस्य दौशोत्तवमकारयत् ।
 सोमचन्द्र इति स्वार्तं नाम[ः]स्य गुरोर्वा ॥ ३४ ॥

The verses already given by Kāth, *Indian Antiquary* Vol. XII, p. 254, Note 55, which enumerate the most important events in Hemacandra's life, are

श्रावेदेधरे ११४५ वर्षे शार्तिके पूर्णिमातिथि ।
 लम्भाभवत् प्रभोर्धर्मयागसम्भौ ११५० व्रत तथा ॥ ८५१ ॥
 रसपद्[री]धरे ११६६ सूरिमिष्टा[ः] समजायतः ।
 नन्दद्वपरवौ ११९९ वर्षेवसानमभवत् प्रभो ॥ ८५३ ॥

14 In the *Prabandhakāśikā*, Merutunga makes (p. 207) Mantrin Udayana relate the story of Hemacandra's youth in the following manner

अन्यदा श्रीहेमचन्द्रस्य कोकोत्तरेणैरपदवद्दयो रूपातिर्मात्रिभुवनमिति पत्रम् । यदीदं पुरपरत्वं समस्तवंशावतरो
 बंदो देवो च समस्तपुण्यप्रेक्षिति नि रोगपुण्यकरे नगरे च कश्चिन् ससुखमिति । नृपादेशादनु स भद्रो जन्ममष्टुति तथारिं
 प्रविशमिष्यमाह । अद्योष्टमनामनि देवो धनुष्कानिषादे नगरे श्रीमन्मोदयशो चाविगतासा व्यवहारी । सदीजवमावहिका निव-
 शासनदेवीय सत्सधर्मचारिणी शरीरीयव धी पाहिणीनाम्नी । चासुण्डगोत्रजबोराधारेणाद्वितनामा तयो पुत्रश्चाहदेव समजनि ।
 सदीयतिपचाया उपरि सवर्धोभिः सिधुभिः स्ननं रममाण सहासा निपसाह । सद्गम्यत्रातां जगद्विद्वत्तयां देवनमस्करणाय प्राप्तेषु सिंहासनस्थित-
 अयं यदि क्षत्रियकुले जातस्तदा सार्यं भोगमश्नयती । यदि धर्मस्थितकुले जातस्तदा महाभाव । चेरार्थं प्रतिपद्यते उदा युगप्रधान
 इव मुपे पुण्येऽपि कृतपुण्यमवतारयति । स आचार्य इति विचार्य तत्रगत्वात्तामैव्यवहारिभिः समं तस्मिन्सया चाचितुमिहागत इति व्याहारत् ।
 सन्निधाविरो प्रामात्यरभाभिः सत्यया विवेकिन्या स्वामजादिभिः परितोषित- श्रीसेयस्वपुत्रं आचितुमिहागत इति व्याहारत् ।
 अथ सा हर्षीमूनि मुशन्ती स्वं रत्नगर्भं मन्मथाना । श्रीसेयस्वीर्षुहृतां मान्यः स सपुत्रं याचत इति हर्षोत्तरदे विपादः । यत्

एतस्मिन् नितास्तमित्यादिभिः । अपर तादोऽपि सन्प्रति ग्रामे न । तै स्वज्ञनेस्त्वया दीयतामित्यभिहिते स्वदोषोत्तरणाय सानामात्रं
शुण्णाय पुनस्त्वयो गुरुभ्यो ददे । तदनन्तरं तथा श्रीदेवचन्द्रसुरिरेति वदीयमभिलिखानमयोधि । तेर्गुरुभि सोऽपि शिशु शिष्यो
भविष्यसीति पृष्ट ओमित्युच्यते प्रतिनिवृत्तौ समं कर्णवत्सामान्यम । मद्युदयनगृहे तत्सुते समं बालधारकं पाह्यमानो
पावदास्ते तावता ग्रामा-तदागतव्यापिगम्य वृत्तान्तं परिज्ञाय पुनर्दर्शनमधि सन्ममसमसाहाराक्षेपा गुरुणा नाम मत्वा कर्णोपवी
प्राप्य वृहत्सत्त्वयुक्ते कुवितोऽपि तानीपत् प्रणम्य गुरुभि सुतासुरेणोपलब्धं त्रिचक्षणतया विविधाभिरावर्जनाभिरावर्जितस्तज्जानी-
तेनोदयनमत्रिगा धर्मयशुव्याया निजामदिने नीत्वा ग्याय सहोदरभक्त्या भोजयामके । तवतु चान्नदेव सुतं पृच्छन्ने निवेद्य
पञ्चाङ्गनसादसहितं दुःकूलजं प्रत्यक्षं रक्षत्रं चोपनीय सनन्निष्कामयजिज्जितं प्रति चाशियं ब्रूह । क्षत्रियस्य मूल्येनीत्यधिकसहस्रं
गुरगस्य मूल्ये पञ्चाशदधिकानि सप्तदश शतानि । अविज्ञितपरत्वमपि यथितो मृत्ये नवनयतिरुहमा । एतावता नवनयतिरुहमा
भवन्ति । त्वं तु वृक्षत्रयसर्पयक्षैदायैच्छन्नता कार्पण्यं प्रादुर्च्यसे । नदीय सुतस्यापदनम्यो भवदीया च भक्तिरवर्धयन्ता । तदस्य
मृत्ये सा भक्तिस्तु । शिवनिर्मात्यमित्रारयद्वयो मे प्रविवक्षय । इत्थं चाचिगे सुतस्य स्वरूपमभिदधाने प्रमोदभूरितचित्तं स
मक्षयकुण्डोत्पन्नतया तं परिम्य साधु साधितं वदन् धीमान् उदयन ब्रूह । मम सुततया समर्पितो योगिमर्कट इव सर्वथा
जनानां नमस्कृत्य कुर्वन् केवलमपमानपात्र भवितुम् । गुरुणा दत्तस्य गुरुरपि प्राप्य बालेन्दुरिय त्रिभुवनमरुदण्यो जायते । यथोचितं
पिचार्यं व्याहरेत्तादिति स भवद्विचार एव प्रमाणमिति वदन् गुरुराशं नीत्वा सुतं गुरुवोदीदपत् । उदयु सुतस्य प्रमत्याकण्योत्सप-
चाचिगेन चक्रे ॥

The above text does not agree exactly with the edition. A few better readings have been inserted from the above mentioned MSS. Marutunga's language is here as generally in the *Prabandha-
candimānava*, very much mixed with Gujarati idioms. The word *varahis*, which occurs above, line 5 of
the Skt. text, means a set of buildings in which there are a temple and a monastery, and corresponds
to the term *basti*; *o varahis* which is used by the Digambaras.

15 *Prabandhakaṣa*, pp 98L

ते विहरन्तो धन्यछुरे गुणधरासुराष्ट्राक्षयिध गता । तत्र देवनायिलर । तन्नायामेकदा मेमिनागवामा
धायक समुत्थाय देवचन्द्रसूरीष जती । भगवन्नय मोदयतीत्ये सन्नोनीराहिणीकुशिलकुशाधि[धि]नन्दनश्चाज्ञेयनामा
भवतां देवानो धृत्वा प्रउदो दीक्षा याचते । अस्मिन् ग्रामे नम भग्[नि]म्ना रक्षकारक स्मृते एष्ट । स य [प] स्मानन्दरे
गुह्यतः सदृशीं परस्मतिमापाति सा । गुरव आहु । स्वानन्दरगतवशास्य सहिमा मेधियते । मह्यं पावमती योग्य
सुखस्यो दीक्षणीय । केवलं पित्रोस्तुष्टा प्राप्ता । गतीं नाहुलभाम् [नि]वेद्यो पाहिनी[गो]चावि[चि]कारितम् । उक्ता प्रत-
पातना । कृतस्नानार्थं प्रतिवेध । कल्याणपनसतीआज्ञेये दीक्षा लली ।

16 Although the narrative scarcely offers anything new I am giving the particular passage
of the *Kumarapāṇastava*, so as to show by an example how Jinamandana is in the habit of making
use of his predecessors. According to No 286, pp 27-31 the story to which is prefaced a report about
Devacandra that is borrowed from the *Prabandhakaṣa* (see Note 20) reads as follows —

श्रीदेवचन्द्रसुरय एकदा विहरन्तो धन्यछुरे प्रायु । तत्र मोदयरो चा[च]ाधिक श्रेष्टी[क्षी] । पाहिना[नी]
भार्वा । तपन्त्येष्टु स्मरे चिन्तामर्गिष्ट पर गुरमो दत्त । तदा तदामत [ता] श्रीदेवचन्द्रसुरय पृष्ट स्मरन्त्यम् ।
गुरभिरुच्ये । पुत्रो मायौ तव चिन्तामर्गिष्ट [स]त्त्व । पर स सूरिराह जैवराहवत्सको भविता गुरुणा रक्षतामिति ।
गुरवच थापा सुदिव पाहिनीं तदिने गर्भं यमार । सप्त ११५५ कार्तिकपूर्णिमादिप्रसंगे पुत्रजन [न] ।

तदा बागवतीसोदोषोति (धीमात्ये) [भान्य] स तपयित् ।

मिन[मिन]यन् निनपमैल स्थापक सूरिसे[नि]त्तर ॥ १ ॥

जन्ममोक्ष[स]वर्णं चान्नदेवेति नानं दत्तम् । वनेष पञ्चार्थिको नात्र सह मोदवत्सहिकायां देवचन्द्रनायको
बालपापस्यसमायेन देवमत्सरणार्थमागत[त] श्रीदेवचन्द्रसुरनिपपाया निजस [न] । तथा इहा गुरभिरुच्ये पाहिना-
[नि] । सुभाषिके स्मरति तमविपार दुर्बकिय सवाद्यलम् । बालरुद्ररक्षामि त्रिलोक्य मातुरभक्ति । वषप क्षत्रियपुत्रे
वरा सार्धभोगो नेरेन्द्र[न] । यदि म[नि]सत्यमिष्टुले वडा भवावा । प[वि]रु दीक्षां गृह्णामि तदा पुनमयान इव
सुपे सुपे कृतपुण्यमवर्ण[न]त्यतीति । सा पाहिनी गुरवचोम्नेयामिना म्मुया एष्ट गता । गुरोऽपि बाह्यापामागस्य
धीमंयनाकार्यं गता[ः] भवपा[न] भ[भे]ति[दि]ष्टुदे । यमि[चाधि]कं प्राणान्तरं गते वा[पा] हिन्वा हींस्यो गृहाग-
जगगकरपाहिना वीरित । मार्गियम् [भा]रुदेव । इहा पाहिनी हर्षोभूति मुन्नति[नी] स्वैरक्षणार्थं भन्यमानाति

चिन्ताद्वारा जाता । एकत्र प्रत्येकता मिथ्यासिद्धि । तादृशोऽपि मामे गान्नि । एवमस्य भीसपो गृहागत पुत्र याचत
इति किं प्रतीत्य मृदुचिन्ता क्षणमभूत् । ७८ (२) तु ॥

कल्पद्रुमस्तस्य गृहेऽवर्तान्निष्ठासिद्धिरुत्तरे ह्यु [सु] लोड ।

प्रेल्लोचनलक्ष्मीरिति तां पृष्ण [भी] ति गृहाग्रयणं यन्नुनीते सव ॥ १ ॥

तथा ॥

उर्वीं सुर्वीं तदनु जगद् सागरं कुम्भजना

स्यु [ध्यो] मा [या] नी रविदिग्गतां तां च यत्साहिपीठे ।

स प्रौढधीजिनपरिवृद्ध सोऽपि यस्य प्रणन्ता

स भीसपक्षिमुवनगुरं बलम् किं [स्यात् न माय ॥ २ ॥

इति प्रत्युत्पत्त्यवर्तमानां भीसपेन समं [सु] गुरुत्वं कल्पवृक्षजिह्वं गृहाग्रयणं ज्ञायावसरत्वा स्वप्नानुमतिं
रत्ना नि [ज्ञो] तु [पु] न श्रीगुरुभ्यो ददौ । तत्र श्रीगुरभि भीसवपमशम् । ह [दि] वाम भीस [तां] भेदराधकवति
[दि] गणधेरासेवितां सुरासुरनिकनयकमहन्दा [नीयां] सुत्रिकान्तास [स] गमद्व [ती] दीक्षां त्व हाससीति
मोक्षे । स च कुमार शम्भु [रम्भा] चरित्रावरणयकमज्योपस [न] मिन सयमप्रवणमात्रसजातपरसवेग सह [द] सा
भोमिलुवाच । ततो मात्रा स्वनेष्वानुमतं पुत्र सयमानुरागपथिष्य छात्रा धीवीथयात्रा निघाष कर्णावर्ती जगु श्रीगुरव ।
तमोदयनमश्रिगृहे वरसुते सम यालधारके पादयमान सकलसदलोकमाम्य सयमपरिणामघन्यो वैतथिकादिगुणविज्ञो
यावदाहो तावता ग्रामान्तरादागतभ्रात्रिण पतीनिचे [ने] दितधीगुरमधाममपुत्रार्पणादिवृत्तान्तं पुत्रदर्शनावधि [स] न्यद्याद्गार
कपोतसो गत । तत्र वीद्वा गुरव । धृत्वा [ता] धर्मदेवता । मुतानुसारिणोपरदप विषयगतवाभाणि श्रीगुरभि ।

इल पवित्र पतनी वृताधी

यमुधरा भागवती च तेन ।

अवाच्यमार्गो मुलक्षिन्मुग्धो

छीन परमज्ञानि यस्य चेत् ॥ १ ॥

कल [छ] क इतरे वक्षिन् दुर्लेऽनिविमले सुत ।

धननासाकर कश्चिद्व्यसनेर्गुणनाथे ॥ २ ॥

पित्रो मत्तापक कोऽपि दीपने इव [प्रेय] सीड [सु] त ।

शस्त्रेऽपि नि [त्रि] पते कोऽपि स्यात् कोऽपि विकलेऽद्रिष ॥ ३ ॥

सर्वोऽहमुन्दर किं तु ज्ञानवात् गुणनीरपि ।

धीनिनेद्रपयाध्वय [न्य] प्राप्यते दुष्पत सुत ॥ ४ ॥

इति श्रीगुरुसुखादाकर्णं सजातद्रग्द [मोद] प्रसन्नविचाराविगमस्य श्रीगुरुदा [पादा] रविन्दनमस्तस्यै
ममायातेनेदयनमत्रिणा धर्मेवाधयधिया निगृहे नीचा मोचयाचक । उदत्त च [चाङ्ग] देव लदुच्छ [स्त] द्वे
निवेश पद्मप्रसादपूर्वकं दुर्ल [कूल] त्रय पोपनीय समक्षिकमावर्ति [त्रि] तक्षविग साबद मक्षिणमपाद्व [दीव] ।
मक्षिन् क्षत्रियस्य मूल्येऽसीलधिकं सहस्र १०८० । अथमूल्ये पद्माद्व [दाद्व] धिकाति सहस्रा शताति [SIC] ।
सामा-यसापि वक्षिजो नवनवते १९ गनेत्रा । एनावता नवनवर्तलक्ष भवति । त्व तु लक्षत्रयमप्यम् इष्टल
लक्षायसे । अतो मत्तु [स्तु] त्वोनर्थस्त्वदप्या भवितस्त्वन्धर्मता । यदस्य मूल्ये सा भक्तिरस्य । न तु मे द्वयेण
प्रयोगनमस्य [स्त] त्वरधमेतत् भम निचमिर्मांलमिव । दसो मया पुत्रो नवतामिति । चाधिगवच धुत्वा प्रमुदितमना
महो त पर [रि] तस्य साधु शुक्रमेवदिति यदन् पुनहा प्रयुवाच । स्वयय पुत्रो ममापित । परं योग [नि] मकट इव
सर्वेषामभू [पि] जनातां नमरकर कुर्वन् वेवलमपत्रपाछात्र भविता । श्रीगुरुणां तु समर्पित श्रीगुरपद् प्राप्य वात्
[ले] न्दुतिव महती [तां] महनीयो भवतीति विचार्यता यतो [भो] चित्तम् । तत स भवद्विचार धृव प्रमाणमिति षड्
स्य [स] कलधीसपत्तमश्च रत्नकण्ठमिव रक्षणीयमुद् [दु] म्बरगुणमिव दुर्लभं पुत्र क्षमाश्रमणपूर्वकं गुरुणा समर्पयामास ।
श्रीगुरभिरमाणि ।

धनधान्यस्य दातार [] सन्नि नदचन केचन ।

पुत्रनिक्षेपद कोऽपि दुर्लभं पुण्यवान् शुभात् ॥ १ ॥

धनधायादिसर्वसु लोके सारा न् [सु] सतति ।

कत्रपि पुनरुत तु तस्य दान महत्तमम् ॥ २ ॥

पूर्णं पञ्च गच्छे श्रीदत्तसूरिमात्रो वामदेवे पटपदं पुरं गत । तत्र चामि यतोभद्रनामा राजक कदिमात् ।
राजसौमित्रिक उपाधय धर्मादत्त । रायासुमुद्रपद्मपायां राजकेन क्रययो द्वा उपाधये निपण्य । तस्य
राजप्रीयसोमद्रस्य गीताभावात् सूरिपदं जाग श्रीयतोभद्रसूरिर्नि [नि] नाम । तदीयपदं प्रद्युम्नसूरिर्भगवत् । तस्यदे
श्रीगुणसेनसूरि । श्रीयतोभद्रसूरिपदे [?] श्रीदेवचन्द्रसूर्य । राजपुत्रिद्वान्तिनाथचरितदि महापाठपरमनिष्कृन्-
[प्र] ज्ञासमात्र

The portion of Rujas'ekharas narrative immediately following is given above in Note 15
In the *Kumarapalaritra* pp 25 ff Jyamaendura repeats the story told by Rujas'ekhara. The
beginning reads p 25 line 2 'वैदिकगणे वज्रपासाया चन्द्राये श्रीदासूरयो विद्वानो वामदेवेनाय पटपदपुरे प्रापु ।
The series of teachers is given as follows — तस्यै प्रद्युम्नसूरि । तस्यैय श्रीगुणसूरि । तस्यै श्रीदेवचन्द्रसूर्य ॥
Vagada is the old name and still used today of the Eastern part of Kach. Hemacandra's own
statement is given above on p 10 and in Note 66. As regards Devanuri's statement about Devacandra's
Santimathacarita see above Note 1 page 60

21 *Prabandhacintāman* pp 239 f. Hemacandra wished to learn the secret of making gold,
hence Kumarapala like other founders of eras intended to pay off the debts of the world, see also
page 10. Devacandra's name is not mentioned in the text simply the phrase Hemacandra's Guru,
occurs.

22 The most important verses of the *Prabhalacaritra* about the years which Hemacandra
had spent at school read as follows

सोमचन्द्रनाथदोषवत्प्रज्ञावन्तसौ ।
तर्हक्षुण्णसद्विचरिणा [] पयवि [१८] नदं हुतम् ॥ २७ ॥
प्रभाषकपुराण्यर्थसु सूरिपदोचित [] नितम् ।
विद्याय स [स] यमालच [सामग्न] सु [तु] रसोमप्रयतिनि ॥ ४७ ॥
योग्य शिष्य पदं स्वस्य स्वय कार्य [क] पुनोचिनी ।
अद्याप्यै सुम् [पाम्] अद्याप्य [] तदा विधि [दि] तस्यैविदा [स्] ॥ २८ ॥
तदैव विज्ञेयज्ञानकाष्टम स्वया [चा] रयम् ।
मुञ्चत [ते] पुनर्निर्गति क [क] तन्मन्त्रविद्यया ।
चन्द्रम् [स्] पर्वते सुद्रमहारा [रा] चारवतुर [रा] ॥ ५६ ॥
शब्दाद्वैतेय विप्रान्ते समाय [मये] योनि [योनि] से सति ।
परकापरि [त] ताम [स्वम्] जन्मकोट्यभेदुत ॥ ५७ ॥
अवर्णगुरुत्वरचन्द्रनद्वयचिति ।
कृतिन सोमचन्द्रस [यत्] निष्ठा [छा] न्द्रायामस [न] ॥ ५८ ॥
श्रीगोतमादिसूर [री] वैराग्यवित्तमावाधितम् ।
श्रीदेवचन्द्रगुरुत सूरिमन्त्रमौक्तिकयन [यम्] ॥ ५९ ॥
पञ्चमि वृत्तकर्म ॥
निरस्तुतकलाकति कलावेदिकलाभय ।
हेमचन्द्रप्रसु [] भीमकाका विख्यातिभाष स ॥ ६० ॥
तदा च पाणिनी सौधपादेवी सु [सु] न उच्यते ।
तत्र पारिवर्तमादकाविहस्या गुरुदत्त ॥ ६१ ॥
प्रवर्तनी [नी] प्रविष्टा [छा] च दापयामास नान्द्री ।
तदेवा निवापायो [?] गुरुस्य सम्यक्साक्षिकम् ॥ ६२ ॥
सिंहासनगतं तस्या जयस्यतपदेव च ।
कटरे [?] जननीमहिरुत्तमा [मन्ना] धो [कयो] वल ॥ ६३ ॥

The story of the journey is omitted because the majority of the verses are very badly damaged. It is in verses 38-46. Merutunga makes his account much shorter. The end of the passage, as given above, in Note 15, reads -

सय च कुम्भयोनिरवाप्रतिमप्रतिभाभिरामतया समन्वयव्यामोधिमुष्टिप्रयोग्यमनसविवाह्यानो हेमचन्द्र
इति गुह्यतनाम्ना प्रकीर्तयन् मन्त्रसिद्धान्तोपनिषद्व्याख्याय पदत्रिंशत्ता गुणैरहृत्तनुर्गुणैश्चरिषदेतिषिक् । इति मन्त्रयुद्धप-
रोदित जन्मप्रभृति कृतान्त आकर्ष्य नृपतिर्मुमुदेवराजम् ॥

Therefore Merutunga does not know the second name Somacandra. His assertion that Udayana related the story of Hemacandra's youth to King Kumārapāla contains a serious anachronism. As Udayana immigrated to Gujarat in the Vikrama Samvat 1150, and as Kumārapāla ascended the throne in the Vikrama year 1199, and is supposed to have waged several wars before this conversation took place, Udayana could not have still been alive.

Jinamandana *Kum Car* p 31, line 12 up to p 36 line 5 reports a good deal, but merely absurd stories about Hemacandra's apprenticeship-time. He relates, (pp 31-42) that Somadeva received the name Hemacandra because, at the beginning of his apprenticeship, he transmuted coal into gold (*hema*) at the house of a Śresthin named Dhana. Then he contradicts himself on p 36, where he agrees in the main with the *Prabhāvakacarita*. Then instead of one journey of Somadeva's and one supernatural apparition, he speaks of two. The first journey was to be to Kāśmīr, and the second to the Gauda land in company of a Devendra and of the famous commentator Malayagiri. On the first occasion the goddess Sarasvatī appears and on the second Sasanadevatī. Finally we hear that a merchant, named Dhanada, had the honour of an Ācīrya given to Somadeva in the Vikrama year 1160 with the consent of his Guru and of the Saṅgha. The date occurs three times in Jinamandana, is the same each time, and agrees with that of the already mentioned verse of the *Prabhāvakacarita*, cf also Bhāṇḍārkar, *Report on the Search etc* 1683 84 p 14

23. *Alankāraśūdamanī* I 4

मन्त्रदेवतापिष्टे ॥ ५ ॥

मन्त्रदेवतापुमहाद्वित्रयर्षापाधिरि प्रतिभत । इत्यनव्यवर्णक्षदोपसन्ननिमित्तं च स्तोत्राधिरित्यध्वनसारोपाधिरितिमुच्यते ॥

24. *Prabhāvakacarita* XXII 61-73

धीमेनचन्द्रसूर धीमन्मगमा[ग]रुत्तुभ ।

विजयानन्दो धीमन्प्रदित्तुभ[र] सुख ॥ ६१ ॥

धीमिद[र] भूदयेषु राजपदिक्य य[र] ॥ ६२ ॥

हेमचन्द्रमु[सु] दीर्य सत्यधिरितिप्रियम् ॥ ६३ ॥

निरुप दिग्[र] मन्त्रे मन्[ग] मन्त्रमन्त्रमा[र] ॥

मिदिग् मन्त्रिणे[र] मन्त्र मन्त्रा[र] ॥ ६४ ॥

मन्त्र मन्त्र मन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्रमन्त्र ॥

मन्त्रमन्त्र मन्त्रा वि मन्त्र मन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्रमन्त्र ॥ ६५ ॥

मन्त्रेति मन्त्रे मन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र ॥

मन्त्रेति मन्त्रे मन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र ॥ ६६ ॥

मन्त्रेति मन्त्रे मन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र ॥ ६७ ॥

मन्त्रेति मन्त्रे मन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र ॥ ६८ ॥

मन्त्रेति मन्त्रे मन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र ॥ ६९ ॥

मन्त्रेति मन्त्रे मन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र ॥ ७० ॥

मन्त्रेति मन्त्रे मन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र ॥ ७१ ॥

मन्त्रेति मन्त्रे मन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र ॥ ७२ ॥

मन्त्रेति मन्त्रे मन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र मन्त्रमन्त्र ॥ ७३ ॥

तथा हि ।

मूर्ध्नि कामगतिं स्वर्गोत्तमपरस्वैरासिद्ध रत्नाकरा
मुत्तारस्त्रिक्रमावतनुष्वयुद्धं त्व एणकुम्भीभव ।
एवा कल्पयोर्द्वैतानि सत्त्वैर्द्विवासास्त्रोत्पन्ना—
न्यायत स्वर्कैर्विहितं तयदी नन्देति सिद्धापि ॥ ७२ ॥
व्याख्याविश्रुति वृत्ते [हेनच] द्रविमोखत ।
आहुतावावसीयात् [पाल] सूरि संधे पुन पुन ॥ ७३ ॥

Verses 72 has been given after comparison with the *Prabandhaśaṅkhamān* as also with the other work mentioned below (Note 33). All the sources available to me give नन्देति in the fourth Pāda. In spite of this however only नन्देति can be correct.

The above narrative of the first meeting of Hemacandra with Siddharaja is also found in the *Kumarapālacarita*. There however the verse which is supposed to have been written by him (p. 36, lines 9-12) runs —

सिद्धराज राज्ञि राज्ञि राज्ञि
कारय प्रमत्तेतममत्र ।
सत्रस्तनु हर्षेति मितराजस्य
ए [ते] विमच भवतिद मूढता ॥

The divergent form proves that Jinamādana has used another source

25. *Prabandhaśaṅkhamān* p. 144.

26. The *Kumarapālacarita* gives the following anecdotes immedately after the first meeting (1) Hemacandra declares the doctrines of all sects to be equally saving pp. 36-38 (2) Hemacandra mentions the qualities of a man who is worthy (*patra*) of pious gifts pp. 38-39 (3) Hemacandra mentions to the King in Siddhapur the difference between Mahādeva and the Juna pp. 39-40, (4) Some pious foundations of Jayasimha.

As regards the data varying in time of the other sources concerning these stories see pp. 21 f.

27. *Colebrooke Misc. Essays* II p. 275 ed. Cowell where it is also shown that Yasovarman probably ascended the throne only in the year V S. 1190. The contradictory statement in the *Kṛtishāṅkhamudī* II 32 according to which the prince of Mālvā Naravarman who was defeated by Jayasimha was Yasovarman's predecessor may be left without any consideration. For Yasovarman is distinctly mentioned in the *Dryasrayalāṭya* and one may certainly trust that Hemacandra knew the name of the king who was defeated by a lord.

28. According to Forbes extracts from the *Dryasrayalāṭya* (*Indian Antiquary* vol. IV pp. 206 f.) Jayasimha did the following deeds after his return from Mālvā (1) He remained for a time in Siddhapura-Srīsthala and had the Rudra Māts temple or properly speaking the Rudra mahālaya temple restored and had a temple of Mahāvīra built (2) he made a pilgrimage to Somnāth pāṭṭan and Gaur (3) After his return to Anhilval he had the Sahasralinga lake dug and caused many other gardens to be laid out. As Hemacandra in other places where we can control him gives events in their proper order we may trust him here too. If we do this then it goes without saying that Jayasimha must have reigned for a number of years after his return from Mālvā and that this event could not have taken place later than the Vikrama year 1194.

29. *Prabandhaśaṅkhamān* pp. 161-171.

30. The verse is quoted by Kāthi, *Indian Antiquary* vol. VI p. 254 Note 54. The *Prabandhaśaṅkhamān* does not mention directly Hemacandra's presence at the disputation. However it hints at this, by giving a verse which Hemacandra is supposed to have composed in honour of the victory of the Śvetāmbaras. We read in XXI 253-54 —

श्रीसिद्धहेमचन्द्राभिधान[ने] शब्दासुधासने ।
सूत्रधारः प्रभुः श्रीमान् हेमचन्द्रप्रमुज्ज्वलै ॥ २५३ ॥
तथा हि ।

यदि नान कुमुदचन्द्र[च्छ] नावेत्यद् देवसुरिर्हमघचिः ।
कटिपरिधानमथास्तद् कतमः श्वेताम्बरं जगति ॥ २५४ ॥

The verse looks as though it were written to illustrate the use of the Conditional. Kielhorn informs me that it is not to be found in the Commentary to the Grammar.

31. *Prabhāṭakacāritra* XII, 74-115:

अन्यदावन्तिकोशीयपुलकेषु नियुक्त[क]कैः ।
दर्शयमानेषु भूषणै[गत्त्रै]क्षि लक्षणपुलकम् ॥ ७४ ॥
किमेतद्विति पप्रच्छ स्वामी ते स्वयिज्ञापय ।
भोजन्याकरणं तेषां च] शब्दसास्त्रप्रवर्तने ॥ ७५ ॥
भ्रमो[सौ] हि मालवापीतो विद्वच्छक्रिरोमणिः ।
शब्दालङ्कारदैवश्रुतार्थसाक्षाणि निरुमे ॥ ७६ ॥
चित्रितसारानतिज्ञान्तरम[स] वास्तु[त]द्वयानि च ।
अ[र्थे]कलाकुनिकाभ्यात्मस्मरसामुद्रिकाण्यपि ॥ ७७ ॥
ग्रन्थाविमित्तव्याख्यानप्रभञ्जुडामणीविह ।
विवृति[ति] वाद्यम[वाप्येस]ज्ञापयेदास्त्रमेपमालयोः ॥ ७८ ॥
भूपास्त्रेन्यचदत् किं नास्त्रास्त्रोमे दास्यपद्वतिः ।
विद्वान् कोपि कथं नास्ति देदे दिशेपि (!) शृङ्गेरे ॥ ८० [७९]
सर्वे सम्भूय विद्वोसो हेमचन्द्रं व्यलोकयन् ।
महाभक्तया राक्षसावभ्यर्च्य प्रार्थि[तस्ततः] ॥ ८१ [८०]
शब्दपुष्पकिङ्कणार्चं निर्मायास्तन्मनोरथम् ।
पूरयस्व महर्षे त्वं विना त्वामत्र कः प्रभुः ॥ ८२ [८१]
संक्षिप्तश्च प्रवृत्तोयं म[स]मपेक्षित् कलापकः ।
लक्षण[णे] सत्र लिप्यतिः शब्दार्था[न्]नास्ति तादृशी ॥ ८३ [८२]
पाणिनि[ने]लक्षणं वेदस्याह्निलयप्रवन् दिनः ।
..... ॥ ८४ ॥
य(:)सो भम तव श्यातिः शुष्यं च मुनिनायक[:] ।
विश्वलोभेपकाराय कुत व्याकरणं नयम् ॥ ८५ [८४]
(काः) कार्येषु नः भिलोकिः या [र्यः] सारणावे[र्यं]य केवलम् ॥ ८६ [८५]
परं व्याकरणान्यष्टौ वदन्ते पुलहानि च ।
तेषां धीमारतादेपीकोत्त यवालिङ्ग भुषम् ॥ ८७ [८६]
भानाययत काश्मीरदेशात्तानि स्वमानुषि [र्यैः] ।
महाराजो यथा सन्महद् वाग्दशास्त्रं प्रवन्त्यते ॥ ८८ [८७]
इति तस्योक्तमाकर्ण्यं सतस्त(एष)गादेव भूयतिः ।
ग्रन्थानुदयान् प्रीयीद् वाग्देयीदेशमभ्यस्तः ॥ ८९ [८८]
प्रवराख्यपुरे तत्र प्रसूते देवर्षा गिरम् ।
य[च]न्दनाभिनि[भ्य]र्च्यं गृह्युः पावनलपैः ॥ ९० [८९]
समादिशमूल[क्षत् तु तैस्तु]हा निजाधिष्ठा[ष्टा]पचाद् गिरा ।
भम प्रसादचित्तः श्रीहेमचन्द्रः सिद्धाम्बरः [श्वेताम्बरः] ॥ ९१ [९०]

ततो मूलान्तरस्येव यदीयस्यास्य हेतवे ।

सतप [सतप्ये] प्रेयता [तो] प्रेयवध [मं] शुल्लसतप्य [य] ॥ ०२ [९१]

तव सख्यस्य तान् सम्पन् भावतीमविनाहसन् [वा सगम्] ।

शुल्लकान्तरपचामाम् [मे] प्रेयुधोना [सा] हपदि [णि] उम् ॥ ९३ [९२]

भविताधगर स्त्रीय प्रयु दे [दे] शीप्रमादिता [सादत] ।

हपेप्रयपमस्यदुलकाहुरपुतिता ॥ ९४ [९३]

सर्वे [ये] विज्ञापयामासुभूपादाय भिसेदिता [तम्] ।

निरो [ण] प्रमो हेमज्जने [परि] तोरमहादरम् ॥ ९५ [९४]

इत्याकण्यं चमत्तर धारयन् वसुधाधिप ।

उवाच धन्यो महेशो (ह) [मान्यो] यदेता हृत्ती ॥ ९६ [९५]

श्रीहेमसूरयोप्यखलोत्प व्याकरणमगम् ।

शास्त्र चरक [कु] र नव धीमन्तिदाख्यमद्भुतम् ॥ ९७ [९६]

ह्यविश पादसर्पणमहापावमुष्णादिव [म] न ।

धातुसारायणा [गो] पेव सगलि [यद णि] महाशासनम् ॥ ९८ [९७]

सुप्रयद्वृत्तिमन् नामसालनेकाग्रेषुदरा [मुन्दारम्] ।

मौलि एषणशास्त्रेषु विधविद्वत्तिराष्ट [तम्] ॥ ९९ [९८]

त्रिभिविदोपकम् ॥

आदौ विष्णोश्चक्षुषि न हि पादमणि सनेव ।

आयुषा सक्तेनापि शुभधयवल्ग्वानि वत् (१) ॥ १०० [९९]

सरीगोमि व [च] दुर्बोधोपलानानि कानिचित् ।

एवप्रसागित तस्मादिमकि [भिदकि] द्युभातर ॥ १०१ [१००]

धीमूढानमन्वितान्पूर्व [भू] नृणाम् ।

वर्णवर्ण [न] सन्नय पादान्ते श्लोक [एक] क [क] ॥ १०२ [१०१]

तच्चतुर्ध्व च मयान्ते श्लोकौ [कै] विद्वद्भिर्गुह्य ।

पञ्चाधिकै [कै] मत्तस्त्रि विहिता विहितै [त] ॥ १०३ [१०२]

पुष्पम् ॥

राग पुर् [जयुक्] पुर्तोगैश्च विद्वद्भिर्वाचित वत् ।

चक्रे वपत्रयर्षेव [भयेणव] राजा पुलकितैरजो [मरु] ॥ १०४ [१०३]

राजादेशानियुक्तैश्च सर्वैर्यानेभ्यश्च [उ] चक्रे ।

दावाह्वयसद्यै [समह्वयन पत्तये] सेवकाणां दातृत्वम् ॥ १०५ [१०४]

शुल्लका समलेप्यन्त सर्वैर्दसंतिना वत् ।

प्रत्येकमेवादीयन्ताप्येदृणासुधमस्तृणाम् ॥ १०६ [१०५]

विरोपकम् ॥

अङ्ग-चङ्ग-कलिनेषु हाट-कर्जाट-कुट्टणे ।

महाराष्ट्रपुराहास [त] च [त] कण्ठे च मालये ॥ १०७ [१०६]

विश्रुमीवीर्येपाले पाण्डुस्त्रीकपुरणयो ।

गङ्गापारे हरिदारे कालिने [ये] दिग्गयासु च ॥ १०८ [१०७]

ह [ह] रदोत्रे कम्बजुञ्जे गौडग्रीवामरूपयो ।

सपादलक्षवज्रालम्बदे [च] सप्तमध्वन ॥ १०९ [१०८]

नि [ति] इलेष महाप्रोषे चैते मान्यगैस्त्रिके ।

ह [ह] वादिविशदेशेषु दास्य ष्या [वय] स्तावेत स्तुभम् ॥ ११० [१०९]

चतुर्भिः कलापकम् ॥

अन्वेनोप [अन्वेपां च ?] निबन्धानां पुस्तकानां च विहतिः [:] ।

प्राहीयत नृपेन्द्रेण कसी [इमी] सिधु गदादरात् ॥ १११ [११०]

पूतत्तत्र गत [तं] शास्त्रं स्वीयकोशे निवेशितम् ।

सर्वे निदाहृत्येत्येनादत्तं देव्यास्तु का कथा ॥ ११२ [१११]

काकलो नाम कायस्यकुलकल्याणशेखरः ।

अष्टव्याकरणम् [णाप्ये] वा प्रहाविमिवभोगिसद् ॥ ११३ [११२]

प्रभुखं दृष्टमात्रेण ज्ञातव्यार्यमस्य च ।

शास्त्रस्य ज्ञापक [द्] [त्वा] शु विदधेव्यापक [कं] तथा ॥ ११४ [११३]

प्रतिमासं स च ज्ञानप्रशम्यां गृष्टनां दधौ ।

राजा च तत्र निर्युहात् [न] कङ्कणैः समभूषयत् ॥ ११५ [११४]

निष्पद्या अत्र शास्त्रे च दुकूलस्वर्णभूषणैः ।

मुखासनादप्यैश्च ते भूषादेन योजितो [ताः] ॥ ११६ [११५]

After Verse 76 there is in the MS. a part of 78, and after the figure 78 there is 79. I do not think that anything has been dropped out. The second half of Verse 84 is left out, because it is so mutilated in the MS. that no sense comes out of it. The remark in Verse 93 that the servants of Sarasvatī sent Utsāhapaydita, is probably to be interpreted as meaning that this man was among Jayasinhha's ambassadors, and that he was sent home. For, according to the *Prabhāvakacarita* XXI, 135, Utsāha was already present at Devasūri's and Kumudacandra's dispute, in Vikrama year 1181 as a *pārśades'vara*. Therefore he could not have come to Anhilvād at this time, which is much later.

32. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 144-146, pp. 147-148; at the end of the narrative Merutunga gives the first verse of the *Prasādi*. Compare also *Kumārapālacarita*, pp. 41-42.

33. For the restoration of the 35 verses which glorify the first seven Candikya kings, I have used, in addition to A. Weber's information in the *Katalog der Berliner Sanskrit-und Prakrit-Handschriften*, vol. II, 1st section, pp. 211, 220-21, 230-31, 235, 242-43, the information in Peterson's *Third Report* and in Pischel's edition of the *Prakrit-Grammatik*, I, pp. V, II, p. 57, 93-99, 129, as well as a Collation of the Bombay MSS. for the first 28 verses, which my friend Kielhorn kindly left with me. The variants of them, mostly very valuable, are designated "K".

पाद १ (भाषां वृत्तः) ।

हरिदिव यद्विबन्धकरखिलयुक्तः विनारुपागिरिव ।

कमलाश्रयश्च विभिदिव जवति श्रीमूलराजमुपः ॥ १ ॥

पाद २ (भाषां) ।

पूर्वभवदारागोपीहराशरणादिव परलिवमन्तुः ।

श्रीमूलराजप्रसूतोपमोदपीद् दुर्मदानीरात् ॥ २ ॥

पाद ३ (वृत्तम्) ।

चक्रे श्रीमूलराजेन नयः कोरि यशोर्णवः ।

परकीर्तिसखन्तीनां न प्रप्रेरामदत्त सः ॥ ३ ॥

पाद ४ (वसन्तविलम्बा) ।

लोककण्ठमङ्गलयनेः कचकर्णलेश

चरप्राङ्मुखेननसदपकर्मभिः ।

श्रीमूलराजवद्वृत्तिभिदिदिष्टेभ्यः

सेव्ये च कोरि च निराश मुदकिपश्च ॥ ४ ॥

पाद ५ (अनुष्टुप्) ।

भ्रातृद जातेति हे भूया मा ख स्वयत्त धाननम् ।
हरि शेतेय न वेप मूलराजमहापति ॥ ५ ॥

पाद ६ (अनुष्टुप्) ।

मूलार्क श्रूयते दाखे सर्वाकल्याणकारणम् ।
अधुना मूलराजस्तु बित्र लोकेषु गीयते ॥ ६ ॥

पाद ७ (अनुष्टुप्) ।

मूलराजातिधारायौ निगमे ये महीभुजा ।
उन्मज्जन्तो^१ विलोडयन्ते स्वागद्गारास्तेषु ते ॥ ७ ॥

पाद ८ (उपजाति) ।

ध्रीमूलराजक्षितिपदयवाहु
दिभर्ति पूर्वाचलश्रद्धाशोभाम् ।
सकोचयन् वैरिमुल्लासुनानि
यस्मिन्नय स्फूर्जति चन्द्रहासं ॥ ८ ॥

पाद ९ (अनुष्टुप्) ।

असरम्भा अपि बिर दुस्सदा वैरिभूभृतर ।
चण्डाभ्रासुण्डराजश्च प्रतापसिद्धिनि रुणा ॥ ९ ॥

पाद १० (अनुष्टुप्) ।

ध्रीमद्वलभराजल्ले प्रताप कोपि दुस्सद ।
प्रसरन् वैरिभूषेण दीर्घनिद्रामकल्पयत् ॥ १० ॥

पाद ११ (अनुष्टुप्) ।

ध्रीदुर्लभेनाशुमणे पादास्तुदुबिरे^२ न कै ।
सुलक्ष्मिर्मेदिनीपारैर्वालखित्यैरिवाग्रत ॥ ११ ॥

पाद १२ (अनुष्टुप्) ।

प्रतापतपन कोपि मूलराजैर्नवोभवत् ।
रिपुक्षीमुखपद्माना न सेहे य किल धियम् ॥ १२ ॥

पाद १३ (अनुष्टुप्) ।

कुर्वन् कुतलशैथिल्य मण्यदेश निपीडयन् ।
अद्रेषु विलसन् मूमेर्मताभूद् सीममूपति ॥ १३ ॥

पाद १४ (अनुष्टुप्) ।

ध्रीसीमपुत्रनोलावरजोभिर्वैरिभूमुजाम् ।
अहो चित्रमपघन्त ललाटे जलविन्दवा ॥ १४ ॥

पाद १५ (अनुष्टुप्) ।

कर्ण च सिल्पुराण च निर्जित्य युधि दुर्जयम् ।
ध्रीसीमेनापुनर श्वरे महाभारतमन्यया ॥ १५ ॥

पाद १६ (उपजाति) ।

दुयोपनोर्भीपतित्रैत्रबाहु
गृहीतवेदीशकरोवतीर्ण ।

१ सर्वक MSS

२ So according to K

३ Probably the last Pāda stood originally after the first one.

४ So according to the MS of Elph Coll (K)

अनुमहीतुम् पुनरिन्दुवंशं
श्रीमीमदेवः किल मीम एव ॥ १६ ॥

पाद १७ (वार्ता) ।

अगणितपञ्चेपुत्रलः पुरपोत्तमचित्तविस्मयं^१ जनयन् ।
रामोद्धासनमूर्तिः श्रीऋणैः कर्ण इव जयति ॥ १७ ॥

पाद १८ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

अकृत्वासननिर्वन्धमभित्वा पापनीं गतिम् ।
सिद्धराजः परपुरप्रवेशयशितां^१ ययौ ॥ १८ ॥

पाद १९ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

मात्रयाप्यधिकं^१ कंक्षित सहन्ते जिगीषवः^१ ।
इतीव न्वं धरानाथ धारानाथमपाकृथाः ॥ १९ ॥

पाद २० (शार्दूलविक्रीडित) ।

क्षुण्णाः क्षोगिभृतमनेककटका भग्नाथ धारा ततः
वृण्डः सिद्धपतेः कृपाण इति रे मा मंसत क्षत्रियाः ।
आरुडप्रयलप्रतापदहनः संप्राप्तधारश्चिरात्
पीरथा मालययोविदक्षुसलिलं हन्तायथेधिष्यते ॥ २० ॥

पाद २१ (उपजाति) ।

श्रीविक्रमादित्यनरेश्वरस्य
त्यथा न किं विप्रकृतं^१ नरेन्द्र ।
यदांस्यदार्पीः^१ प्रथमं समन्तात् ।
क्षणादनादरिरथ राजधानीम् ॥ २१ ॥

पाद २२ (तिलहरिणी) ।

गृष्ट्वा दोःकण्डूं समरशुवि वैरिक्षितिशुजां
शुजादण्डे द्रुमः कति न नवखण्डी वसुमतीम् ।
यदेवं साम्राज्ये विजयिषि विवृण्वेव भनखा
यदो योगीशानो विवसि शृप तत्कस्य सदशम् ॥ २२ ॥

पाद २३ (तिलहरिणी) ।

जयस्त्रम्भान् सीमान्यधिजलधिबेलं निहितवान् ।
वित्तमैर्महाण्डं शुचिगुणगरिष्ठैः विहितवान् ।
यदाखेजोरूपैरलिपत जगन्त्यर्धघुसृणैः
कृतो याग्रानन्दो विरमति न किं सिद्धनृपतिः ॥ २३ ॥

पाद २४ (see above Note 24) ।

पाद २५ (अनुष्टुभ्) ।

लब्धलक्ष विपक्षेषु त्रिलक्षालयवि मार्गणाः ।
तथापि नव सिद्धेन्द्र दातेर्युक्तधरे यदाः ॥ २५ ॥

पाद २६ (वसन्ततिलका) ।

उत्साहसाहसयता भयता नरेन्द्र
धारायतं किमपि वद्विषमं निदेये ।
यस्मात्फलं न सल्लु मालयमाग्रमेव
धीपर्वतोपि तत्र कन्दुकनेलिपाग्रम् ॥ २६ ॥

पाद २७ (मालिनी) ।

अयमयनिपनीन्दो मालवेन्द्रावरोध-
 सनकलक्षपविभ्रं पतन्हीं छुनातु ।
 कथमखिलमहीधुमौलिमागिरयभेदे
 घटयति पटिमानं मग्नधारस्तवासिः ॥ २७ ॥

पाद २८ (मालिनी) ।

क्षिनिपर भवदीयः क्षीरधारावलक्षै
 रिपुविजययशोभिः श्वेत पूवासिदण्डः ।
 किमुत कथयितेनैः बभ्रलेनोत्थीनां
 परिणतमहिमानं कालिमानं तनोति ॥ २८ ॥

पाद २९ (शार्ङ्गलक्षिकीकृत) ।

यद् दोमण्डलकुण्डलीकृतचतुर्दण्डेन सिद्धाधिप
 श्रीते वैरिकुल्यारया किल दलखुन्दारदातं यशः ।
 आन्वा श्रीणि जगन्नि खेदविवशं तत् मालवीनां व्यभाद्
 आपाण्डौ सनमण्डले च धरले गण्डस्थलेऽस्त्रिणिम् ॥ २९ ॥

पाद ३० (उपेन्द्रवज्रा) ।

द्विपयुरक्षोद्विनोदहेतोद-
 भवादवामस, भवद्भुजस ।
 अयं विनोदो भुवनेक्षीर
 पर न यत् कामनपाकरोति ॥ ३० ॥

पाद ३१ (शार्ङ्गलक्षिकीकृत) ।

उर्ध्वं स्वर्गनिकेतनादपि तले पातालमूलादपि
 स्वर्गोर्विभ्रमति क्षितीश्वरमणेऽपारे पयोधरेषि ।
 तेनास्ता प्रमदास्तभावसुलभैरचावधैश्चापलेखै
 ते चाधयमकृतयोषि मुनयो मौनव्रतं त्याजित ॥ ३१ ॥

पाद ३२ (वसन्तविलका) ।

आसीद्विनापतिरमुद्रचतु समुद्र-
 शुद्धाङ्कितक्षि तिमिरशमयाहुदण्डः ।
 धीगूलराज इषि दुर्धर्तैरिडुग्भि-
 वण्डीरव मुचिमुल्लस्यकुलावतसः ॥ ३२ ॥
 तस्यान्वये समजनि प्रबलप्रकाप-
 तिम्ममुक्ति क्षीतिपतिर्जयमिहदेवः ।
 येन स्वर्गसखितर्दपर मुधांसी
 धीमिद्रराज इति नाम निजं व्यलेलि ॥ ३३ ॥
 सम्यग् निवेद्य चतुरश्रतुरोष्णुपायात्
 जित्वोपमुज्य च भुवं चतुरव्यकाक्षिम् ।
 विद्याचतुष्टयविनीतमतिजितात्मा
 काष्ठानवाप पुरुरार्धचतुष्टये य ॥ ३४ ॥
 तेनातिविस्तृतपुरागमविप्रकीर्ण-
 शम्भराजशासनसमूहकद्वयितेन ।
 अन्यर्धितो निरवमं विधियद् व्यधत्
 शम्भराजशासनमिदं मुनिहेमचन्द्रः ॥ ३५ ॥

TRANSLATION

1 The King Sri Mularaja is victorious who establishing the oblation is like Hari who chained Bali (बलिबन्धक)—who endowed with three (royal) powers (शक्ति), is like the Bearer of Pinaka accompanied by (the goddess) Trisakti—who the refuge of Kamala is like Brahman whose Throne is lotus (Kamala)

Note The three powers of the king originate from his majesty energy and incantation As regards the goddess Trisakti see Aufrecht *Oxf Lat* p 59 The third simile used in the verse is already found in Mularaja's gift of land see *Indian Antiquary* vol. VI p 191

2 Burnt with anger as if through remembering the abduction of the Gopis, his wives in an earlier life Sri Mularaja (an incarnation of) Purusottama killed the haughty Ābhūras

Note Mularaja killed as is described in the *Dvayavaya* (*Indian Antiquary* vol. IV, pp 74 77) Grahastripa the Ābhūra king of Sorath who was alleged to be an incarnation of Narakaśūro The latter had stolen a lot of shepherdesses whom Kṛṣṇa released and married see H H Wilson's *Vaṇspurāṇa* vol V pp 87 92 104 (ed. F E Hall)

3 Sri Mularaja has created from his fame a new type of an ocean which prohibits entry to the rivers of renown of his enemies.

4 As the jackals entertained themselves on the battlefield with the princes killed by Sri Mularaja even so did the Apsaras in heaven through passionate physical embraces through hair-pulling through kissing the lotus-face (and) through inflicting wounds by nails.

Note The last words describe in relation to the Apsaras the *bahya sambhoga* as presented in the *Kamasāstra*

5 Do not leave the forest o princes thinking the rainy season has set in " Does not is here a bon—th's great Ling Mularaja ?

Note The princes who defeated by Mularaja had fled into the forest might think that the danger was over on account of the impossibility of military operations during the rainy season. They were however to realise that Mularaja's hon ble energy would enable him to find them out.

6 It is heard in the Sastra that the Mula sun is the root of evil And yet what a wonder that now the Mula ling is praised in the three worlds!

Note The conjunction of the sun with the Mula spells destruction as surely this moon house, whose protecting duty is Nirrti works only evil.

7 The princes who are drowned in the water of Mularaja's swords are seen emerging in the floods of the heavenly Ganga.

8 The arm of Sri Mularaja on which this sword sparkles, possesses the beauty of the peak of the eastern mountain on which the moonlight shines. It deforms the face of the enemies (as this deforms) the day lotuses.

9 The grim sparks of the fire of the strength of the Ling Cūmunda are although not handled for a long time still unbearable to enemy princes.

Note I think this means even though Cūmunda has been dead for a long time the memory of his power is still painful to his enemies.

10 An unbearable heat (of power) was that of the Ling Śrīmad Vallabha, when it attacked the enemy kings it caused (them) a long sleep (of death).

11 who among the lords of the earth like the *Vatālakhyas* has not praised the feet of the sun like King Durlabha while yawning (?) before the latter!

Note The kings are compared to the *Vatālakhyas* in order to suggest that they, like the latter are as dwarfs compared with Durlabha. The conjugation of *lul* according to the sixth class does not agree with the rule given by Pāṇini. In Hemacandra's *Dhatuparavyaya* also the verb is not found amongst those of the sixth class. *Vatālakhyas* is probably either a scribal error for *luḥadbhāḥ*, or else Hemacandra has made himself guilty of a Prakriticism.

12 Of a novel type was the son of masculinity of Mulanaya's offspring, for it does not tolerate the beauty of the day lotuses (viz.) the faces of the women of his enemies.

Note Bhama I is probably meant by the offspring of Mularāja.

13 King Bhuma became the husband of the earth as in making the Kuntal empire loose he loosened her hair locks (*kuntala*) as in suppressing the Madhyadesa he pressed the middle portion (*madhyadesa*) of her body (and) as in sporting in the land of Angas he enjoyed her body (*anga*).

Note These victories of King Bhuma are not mentioned in the *Dvyasrayalavya*, hence they may be poetic fictions invented for the sake of introducing figures of speech.

14 The dust which the army of Śrī Bhuma raised increased the water-drops on the foreheads of the enemy kings: what a wonder!

15 Śrī Bhuma has now recast the Mahabharata inasmuch as he has won Karna and (also) Sindhura who was hard to be conquered in a battle.

Note According to the *Dvyasrayalavya* Bhama I defeated Karna the King of Cedi or Dahala and Hammaka the prince of Sindhu *Indian Antiquary* vol. IV pp. 114-23. Bhama of the epic often conquered Karna *Mahabharata* VII 131-133-139. However the latter was killed by Arjuna *Mahabharata* VIII 41. The epic Sindhu prince Jayadratha also was killed by Arjuna *Mahabharata* VII 146.

16 Śrī Bhumadeva whose arm conquered the kings who were hard to be fought against (*दुर्गुणोर्वरि*) and who took tribute (*तृ*) from the Cedi prince: is indeed the Bhuma whose arm conquered Duryodhana and who seized the hands (*तृ*) of the Cedi prince and who has come down in order to favour again the Moon race.

Note The Caulukyas or Solankis of Aihvala belonged to the Moon race: see below verse 33 and the *Dvyasrayalavya* *passim* and the Pandavas were also the descendants of Pura.

17 Victorious is Śrī Karna who did not mind the strength of the god with the five arrows, who generated wonder in the minds of best men whose form possessed bright splendour and who therefore is like Karna who did not mind the strong (heroes) with five arrows who generated wonder in the heart of Puruṣottama whose form possessed lovely splendour.

Note In the *Ratnamālā* (*Jour De Br. R. A. S.* vol. IX p. 37) we read: His (Bhuma's) son Karna was of fair complexion. The beauty of the form of the epic Karna is described in the *Mahabharata* VIII 91-90-91. Puruṣottama or Kṛṇa was Arjuna's character in the fight against Karna. The five strong of the arrow are the five sons of Pandu. The assertion that King Karna despised the power of the Love god is probably an unjustified piece of flattery. For in the *Ratnamālā* loc. cit., we read of him: "He was lustful."

18. (a) Without making a long stop in a camp without interrupting the wind like speed of the march Siddharāja attained the capacity to enter the city of the enemy.

(b) Without much perseverance in the ascetic postures, without interrupting the movement of respiration, Siddharāja attained the power of entering the body of other beings.

Note The verse has a double meaning. On the one hand, Viharaja is described as a fortunate conquerer with particular reference to the conquest of Ujjain. *Indian Antiquary*, vol IV, p 266. He is complimented, on the other hand upon having attained one of the goals of Yoga without following the ascetic practices. The *pariprasaṅga* is described in detail by Hemacandra in the *Yogasāstra* V, 264-272. The second meaning of *abhiṭṭha paramam gatim* is *pranāyāmān alvitrā*.

19 Those aiming at victory do not tolerate any one who is superior to them even by the length of a vowel. It is therefore that thou a lord of the earth (*dhara*), hast driven away the lord of Dhara.

Note The lord of Dhara is Yasovarman whom Siddharaja took captive.

20 O warriors! Do not think that the sword of the king Siddha is now blunt because it has killed many armies of the (enemy) kings and consequently Dhārā (both the city and the edge of the sword) is broken. Ah, it will still be stronger as on it a mighty fire of strength is kindled, as it has won Dhara (both the city and the edge) after it had drunk for long the water of tears of the Malava women.

Note The second half of the verse affirms that the sword is forged over again.

21 How much harm hast thou not a lord of men wrought to the king Vikramāditya! First thou hast robbed him of his fame, then thou hast destroyed his capital in a moment.

Note Jayasinha robbed Vikramāditya's fame, as he was still more generous than the famous king of Ujjain, compare below verse 25.

22 How many have not held in a strong arm the earth having nine parts, after they have driven away the tickling of the might of the hostile ruler on the battlefield! That thou of king enjoyest the fame of the lords among the ascetics an account of thy mind free from greed even though possessing so rich an empire to whom is this similar?

Note The verse confirms the account of the *Prabandhas* about Jayasinha's philosophical studies.

23 Victory pillars he has erected on his frontiers on the shore of the ocean, he has covered "Brahman's Egg" with a canopy which is very valuable because of the brilliant texture—(of his) brilliant virtues, he has embalmed the worlds with excellent saffron in the form of his fame, he has celebrated a pilgrimage-feast, why does the king Siddha not yet rest?

Note Although *gatrā* is a word with two meanings it can only mean "pilgrimage" here. For there has already been mention of Jayasinha's various undertakings. Besides these, the author wishes to emphasize the piety of the king just as in the previous verse. As regards the point as to which pilgrimage is meant see above page 18.

24 See above, page 13 of the text.

25 With the enemies the *mārgaras* attain their aim with thee they miss it. Notwithstanding this, thy fame of generosity rises high above the nape, a king Siddha.

Note *mārgara* means both 'a begger' and an 'arrow'.

26 Thou, o king, possessor of zeal and enterprise hast completed a difficult venture, the vow of taking *dhārā* through which not only Mālavā was thy reward but also Sripavata as toy.

Note *Dhārātrata* is put instead of the more usual *asidharatrata* for the sake of a word play on the name of the town *Dhārā*, nothing is said in the *Prabandhas* or in the *Dīpāmraya* about the conquest of a hill fortress Sripavata. Perhaps the word is not meant to be read as a proper name but means only "a hill of riches".

27 This sword of thine, Moon amongst princes, may destroy the face-decoration which has been sanctified through the round breasts of the wives of the Mālava king! How can it possess

sharpness as *Dhārā* (the City and the edge) is destroyed by the cracking of the carbuncle-stone on the heads of all princes?

28. Lord of earth is thy strong sword white from the fame of victory shining like a milk stream over enemies? Or is it coloured deep-black from the swallowed eye-anointment of the Mālava women?

29. With the bow bent in a ring by an encompassing arm thou winnest King Siddha thy fame which shines white like the blooming Jasmine—that rested itself worn out from wandering through the three worlds on the pale round breasts of the Mālava women and on their pale cheeks.

Note For the last part of the verse Compare *Nivāsahavakācarita* XI 100 where too the paleness of the women caused by care and anxiety is identified with the fame of the conqueror. See also Fischel, *Hem. Pral. Gram.* vol. II p. 57

30. Between Bhava who caused joy by destroying the three fortified cities of his enemies (the Asuras) and thy right hand who caused joy by destroying the fortified cities of (thy) enemies the difference is a only hero of the world that this one does not refuse (to grant even) strange wishes (*param kāmam nāpārāṇi*) while that one destroyed the greatest god of love (*param kāmam apārāṇi*).

Note Compare Fischel *loc. cit.* p. 99

31. Even above the heavenly palaces even under the undermost ground of the hell even beyond the ocean thy fame wanders, o Jewel among the princes. Therefore her various frivolities which are common to the feminine nature has enticed the ascetics even the restrainers of speech to break the vow of silence.

Note Cf. Fischel *loc. cit.* p. 119 who erroneously divides *te nasyah* in the text missing thereby the meaning of the second half of the verse. Weber has rightly given *ten asyah*, i. e. *tena asyah* (sail, kirtih)

32. It was once a prince among men named Śrī Mularāja a lion for the irresistible enemy elephants an ornament of the pure Caulukya race whose strong arm was capable to carry the burden of the earth bounded by the four unmeasurable oceans.

Note Or a lion for (the) elephants his enemies as hard to be conquered.

33. In his race was born the King Jayasimhadēva a son of the most powerful majesty who inscribed his other name Śrī-Siddharāja in the moon—the procreator of his race.

Note The Caulukyas belong to the moon race see above verse 16. The spots in the moon are often explained by poets as *pruṣṭis* of their patrons.

34. He, the clever one employed all the four means (of politics) he conquered and enjoyed (the possession) of the earth encircled by the four oceans through (the study of) four sciences he formed his understanding he mastered his own self. In this way he attained the aim through the four kinds of endeavours of men.

Note As regards the four branches of science which Jayasimha studied compare *Manu* VII 43.

35. Requested by him who was tortured by the mass of the sciences of words which were too long too difficult to be studied and scattered (all over the world) the monk Hamacandra composed this science of words according to the rules, that is not the last (in rank).

Note *Durīgama* difficult to be studied can also mean teaching what is wrong "According to the rules" that is, in such a way that it consisted with the *Uddisūtra* the *Ganapāṭha*, the *Dhātupāṭha*, the *Liṅgīnus dāna*, of five parts and formed a *pañcāṅgam vyākaraṇam*, as required by usage.

34 About Hemacandra's Grammar see Kielhorn *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* vol II p 18 Pischels remarks in the Preface to his edition of the Adhyaya VIII, and the description of the MSS in A Weber's *Katalog der Sanskrit und Prakrit Handschriften der Berliner Bibliothek* and about the allusions to the historical events of Jayasimha's time in the examples of the Commentary see Kielhorn *Indian Antiquary* vol VII p 267 Hemacandra's Commentary written by himself exists in two versions the *Bṛhat* and the *Laghu Vṛtti*. Both are authentic Besides the fact that both commentaries contain the examples and the *Prasasti* the following may also be given as a proof of their authenticity Devendra a pupil of Hemacandra's pupil Udayacandra wrote possibly still during Hemacandra's lifetime but certainly before 1214 A D a Commentary to the *Bṛhat Vṛtti* under the name *Kataviddurgapadavyakhyā*. There are MSS of this work in Berlin see Weber *loc cit* p 237 cf. 238 240 A palm leaf MS of the same which is in the *Bṛhannanakosa* in Jessalmir was written about forty years after Hemacandra's death. According to my notes the beginning reads as follows —

॥ अहं ॥ प्रगन्ध केवललोकावलोकितमयम् ।
जिनेन श्रीसिद्धहेमचन्द्रसद्भाषितात्मने ॥ १ ॥
शब्दविद्याविदा वन्द्योदयचन्द्रोपदेशात् ।
न्यासतः कतिचिदुपपदव्याख्याभिधीयते ॥ २ ॥

and the end fol 180 स्वाकरणस्तुक्पावर्णिकायां पठ पाद समाप्त । प्रथमपुस्तिका प्रमाणीकृता ॥
संवत् १२७१ वर्षे कार्तिके शुद्धि पक्षे शुके श्रितरक्ताश्विना आदेशान प The date corresponds to the 10th October 1214 a Friday

As regards the *Laghu Vṛtti* the oldest MS preserved in the Cambray Library was written during Hemacandra's lifetime V S 1224 *bindrapada end 3 budhe* see Peterson *First Report*, App pp 70-71 In the MSS used by Pischel for his edition of the Prakrit Grammar the *Laghu Vṛtti* bears the title *Prakāśika* which is otherwise often missing

The *Dhundhika* or etymological explanation of the words occurring in the Commentary, was not written by Hemacandra in spite of the fact that it is sometimes ascribed to him in the Colophon of the Padas The *Dhundhika* to the Sanskrit-Grammar (Weber *loc cit* p 238) originated with Vinayacandra that to the Prakrit Grammar is by Udayasambhagayogam (*Devan College Collection* 1873/74 No 276) The latter also contains a Sanskrit translation of all the Prakrit verses which are quoted in the Commentary

35. See Kielhorn's Essays in the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes loc cit* and in the *Indian Antiquary* vol XV pp 181f. cf. also O Franke *Langens Ganga*, p XIV As regards the Grammar of Buddhisagara which Hemacandra used I may add that this work exists There is a palm leaf MS of it written in the 13th century in the *Bṛhannanakosa* in Jessalmir According to the verse of the *Prabhavaliacūtra* quoted by Klatt *Indian Antiquary* vol. XI p 248 Note 20 the work contains eight thousand *Granthas* Buddhisagara lived at the beginning of the 11th century as is shown by the reports given by Klatt *loc cit* from the *Paṭṭavali* of *Kharitara-gaccha* Therefore he is the oldest known grammarian of the Svetambaras

36 *Indian Antiquary* vol XV, p 32

37 Kielhorn *Indian Antiquary, loc cit*, Weber *Katalog der Berliner Sanskrit-und Prakrit-Handschriften* vol II 1st section p 254 where verse 5 of the *Prasasti* and the colophon read as follows —

पदार्ककंदामति कविरूपवती
शब्दशुभासनमहागुणधाराहृष्टा ।
शिष्यामृतप्रकरज[बु]म्भनविमलानुः
ककह पत्र मुहूर्ति जपति शिरापाद ॥ ५ ॥

इति पण्डितपुण्डरीकेन श्रीकण्ठोपदेशेन सत्यप्रकाशिका कृति श्रीदेवसूरीपादप्रोपजीविना गुणचन्द्रेण स्वपरोपकारार्थं श्रीहेमचन्द्रव्याकरणाभिप्रायेण प्राणयि ॥

The correction in the third Pada is by Weber. As regards the name Kākala kakala Kakalla, compare that of the last Rāstrakūṭa king of Mānyakheta who in the inscriptions is called Karka, Kakka Kakkaṣa or Kakkala see Fleet *The Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, p. 38. It may further be mentioned that according to the *Prabandhaśaṁtaman*, p. 169 Kākala was present at Devanūri's disputation and solved by a reference from Sakatīyana's Grammar the question of whether the form *Loṭ* for *Loṭa* would be correct. The *Prabhavakacaritra* attributes the same feat to Utsahapāṇḍita.

38 See *Abhidhanacintaman* verse 1 (ed B hilingk and Rieu) *Anekārthaloṣa* I 1 (Benares Edition) *Chandannasana*, Weber *Catalogus* vol II p. 268. Neither in the *Chandannasana* nor in the *Alamīracudaman* are we told that the *Kopas* were completed. They only speak of the *Sabdānusasana* just as in the Introduction to the *Abhidhanacintaman*. If one does not wish to assume that Hemacandra wrote the *Kopas* and the *Rhetorics* at the same time then it is probable that he regarded the *Kopas* as belonging to the Etymology and therefore did not think it necessary to make special mention of them. This is suggested also by the *Prabhavakacaritra*. The *Sabdānusasana* is mentioned in the *Alamīracudaman* I, 2.

रत्नदुर्गासनेसानि साध्वो बाधो विवेचिता ।

सासाविदादीं कायस्य यथावदुत्तिष्ठन्ते ॥ २ ॥

In the Commentary written by himself, Hemacandra remarks

• भूनेन रत्नदुर्गासनेकास्यानुगासवयोरैककृत्वम् चाह । अथ एव हि प्रायेविक्रमन्यैरिव ग्राह्यते ।

To the others there belongs for instance *Yamana* who enumerates the ungrammatical forms prevalent among the poets

39 *Prabandhaśaṁtaman* p. 148

तथा च सिद्धसाहिबिजवर्णने याप्रयत्नाया ग्रन्थ कृत ।

For the *Devasaraya* I have before me besides the oft-quoted very good extract of K. Förbes in the 4th vol. of *Indian Antiquary*—a MS. of the Vienna University Library, which contains the first ten *Sargas* besides the Commentary of Abhayatilaka.

40 *Jour. As. B. R. A. Soc.* vol. IX. p. 37

41 *Prabhatavakacaritra* XXII 130-140 (129-139) *Prabandhaśaṁtaman* pp. 155-156. About Ramacandra see page 50. Before this story there is in the *Prabhatavakacaritra* XXII, 117-129 a story of a bard who praised Hemacandra in an *Ayabhrāṇṣa*-verse and received a large reward for it. Merutunga *Prab. Cint.* pp. 235-236 relates something similar which is supposed to have happened during Kumārāpala's reign.

42 *Prabhatavakacaritra* XXII 141-173 (140-172)

43. *Prabhatavakacaritra* XXII 174-183 (173-182) *Prabandhaśaṁtaman* p. 205. Furohita Āmiga is a historical personage and is mentioned by his grandson Somes'vara in the *Suratthokasara Bhāṇḍārhar*, *Report on the Search etc.*, 1853/4, p. 20. It is not said there which king he served. However the probability is that he lived under Kumārāpala.

Hemacandra's simile was according to the *Prabhatavakacaritra*, contained in the following verse—

सिद्धो बली हरिणयुद्धमांसभोजी

सर्वसरेण तस्मिन्निहिलैकसारम् ।

पारापत्र खलदिलक्षणभोजनोपि
कामी भवत्यनुदिन वद कोय हेतु ॥

Merutunga has in the first Pada the variant *devadasakana*, in the second *ratam* / *laskataram*. A still more varying reading is to be found in Böhtlingk's *Indischen Spruchen* No 7044. To my knowledge there is no incontestable proof that the verse belongs to Hemacandra.

44 *Prabhalavacarita* XXII 184-380 The verse which Devabodhi is supposed to have composed in honour of Hemacandra reads -

पातु यो हेमनोपाल वम्भर दण्डमुद्राः ।
पद्मरोचनपुत्रम चाप्य् जैनगोचरे ॥

The same also occurs in the *Prabandhacintamani*, p 227 where the first half is attributed to a poet Vis vas vara from Benares and the second half to King Kumrapala. As regards Devabodhi see page 89 and Note 78.

45 *Prabhalavacarita* XXII 311-355 Hemacandra's worship of Ambika is orthodox as this is worshipped as Sasanadevata by all Jinas. The verses which Hemacandra is supposed to have addressed to Siva are given below Note 61.

46 *Kumarapalarita* pp 55-57

47 About the pilgrimage see *Prabandhacintamani* pp 160-161 about the story of Sajjana *ibid* pp 159 160, the verse in honour of Siva is to be found *ibid* p 213.

48 *Indian Antiquary* vol IV p 267

49 *Prabandhacintamani* pp 156 157

आयुक्तं व्रणयोः शोके विवृतो मुनिवल्गवः ।
स्वयुक्तो सदैवनिष्ठः केवली खीयुः पल्लवः ॥

50 *Prabandhacintamani* pp 173 175

51 *Kumarapalarita* pp 37-38 The narrative has here the usual form of the Jaina parables. The place of the action is Santhapana the merchant is called Sahkha and his wife Yasomati. There is no talk of a courtesan but the merchant takes a second wife because he no longer loves the first one. There are also some Sanskrit and Prakrit verses woven in.

52 This second Hemacandra who is often confused with Gurva of Kumarapala was the pupil of Abhayadeva who founded the line of the Maladharn and belonged to the Prasnavahnanakula Madhyamahakha and the Harapuriya Gaccha. Sometimes this Hemacandra is therefore called simply Maladharn Hemacandra. He wrote -

(1) *Sivasamasa* a Prakrit work with a Sanskrit Commentary Peterson *First Report*, App. I p 18 and Kiehlhorn *Report of 1890/1891* App p 93 No 151. The Cambay MS was written by the author himself in V S 1164. Dr Peterson in his notes *Report*, p 63 attributed it erroneously to the grammarian Hemacandra and I equally erroneously agreed with this view in my criticism.

(2) *Bhavarabhavana* a Prakrit work with a Sanskrit Commentary which was completed in V S 1170 see Peterson *Third Report* App I pp 155-156 especially verses 6-11 of the *Prasasta*.

(3) *Uvasamala* a Prakrit work Peterson *First Report* App I, p 91 to which there perhaps also belongs a Sanskrit Commentary written by the author himself Peterson *Third Report*, p 176.

(4) *Satavavrtti Vinayavata* a Sanskrit Commentary on a Prakrit work of Sivasarma Suri.

(5) *Anuyogasūtrāṭīkā* Peterson, *Third Report*, App I pp 36-37, Weber, *Katalog*, vol II, 2nd section p 694

(6) *Saṃhita vṛtti* a Sanskrit Commentary on Jinabhadra's *Bhāṣya* to the *Āśvāsyaśūtra*, Weber, *loc cit* p 787

It is to be noted that the Jamas themselves do not attribute the above named works to the Guru of Kumārāpala and that they therefore know quite well of the existence of two contemporaries of the same name. That Hemacandra the pupil of Abhayadeva went to Siddhartha's court is mentioned by Devaprabha in verse 3 of the *Prasasti* to his *Pundarikacari* : (Peterson *Third Report* App I p 133) where we read "On his (Abhayadeva's) seat there appeared the celebrated Hemasuri a moon amongst the best whose speech nectar the illustrious king Siddhartha drank." Between Devaprabha and Hemacandra there were as the *Prasasti* further tells us three generations of teachers, and Devaprabha therefore probably had lived in the 13th century. A more distant member of the same school is Rājasekhara author of the *Prabandhaśloka* who wrote at about the end of the 14th century (see above Note 3). In the *Prasasti* to his Commentary to Siddhartha's *Nyāyakandali*, Peterson *Third Report* App I p 274 he describes Hemacandra Abhayadeva's pupil as follows -

(8) Endowed with many virtues was the Sun named Sri Hemacandra author of one hundred thousand Śloka who won fame for the *Nṛgranthas*.

(9) He awakened Siddha the husband of the earth and caused (by him) all the temples of his own and of other kingdoms to be adorned with flagstaffs and golden knobs."

(10) In consequence of his teaching Prince Siddha had the command engraved on copper plates that all creatures were to be spared during eighty days in each year.

54. Peterson *Third Report*, App I p 95 verse 9 of the *Prasasti* of the *Amamāyavamsavamsa*. The author Manirātra wrote his work in V. S. 1252 and was a pupil of Samudraghoṣa.

55 The forefathers of Kumārāpala are mentioned by Hemacandra in the *Dryas rāja Indian Antiquary loc cit* pp 232 235 267 and we read in the first passage that *Āṣṭamarāja* renounced the throne voluntarily as he cherished ascetic tendencies. The *Prabandhaśloka* XXII 354-355 gives a part of the genealogical table which agrees with that of the *Dryas rāja*. We read there

इत श्रीकणेश्वराल्ल[.]उ हे[.]श्वरिसेनमि ।

देवमल्ल इत्यसीव मल्ल इव समदाय ॥ ३५५ ॥

तस्य [५] अ[.]श्वरिसेनमल्ल[.] पालितम[.]इत ।

कुमारपालस्तस्योत्तमस्यैवमल्ल इत ॥ ३५५ ॥

Merutunga *Prabandhaśloka* p 191 diverges as he gives the following order - (1) Bhuma I (2) Hampala (3) Tribhuvanapala (4) Kumārāpala. It is only in his work that one finds the report that Kumārāpala's ancestor was the son of a courtesan named Cauladevi. In spite of the fact that this statement originates with a later source it may nevertheless be correct as it explains in a simple manner the aversion of Jayasinha towards Kumārāpala. If Hemacandra says nothing about it this has not much significance as he could not reproach his patron with his illegitimate descent. Jinamandana *Kumārāpalacarita* p 8 says that Bhuma's first wife (vṛddhā) Cakuladevi was the mother of Keśmarāja and that the latter renounced the throne for love of his younger brother. He gives the genealogical table p. 43 exactly the same as Hemacandra and he adds that Kumārāpala's mother was a Kāśmīrī princess (Kāśmīradevi). The latter is more probable than the assumption of an anonymous historical fragment (Bhāṇḍārkar *Report etc* 1833/4 No 11) that she was the sister of Jayasinha Siddharāja. A marriage of this nature within the same family is not allowed with Rājputs and does not occur. Jayasinha's enmity towards Kumārāpala gives Jinamandana p 58 reason to assert that the king had hoped still to obtain a son through Śiva's grace after having cleared Kumārāpala out of the way. Hemacandra probably because he wrote as a court-poet makes no mention of

Jayasinha's hatred towards Kumārāpāla, in the *Dayāsraya*. The story, too, of Kumārāpāla's flight and wanderings only occurs in the *Prabhāvakācaritra*, in Merutuṅga and in later Prabandhakāras. However, there is, in favour of the correctness of this narrative, a verse of the *Moharāja-parājaya* (Kjellhorn, *Report 1380/81*, p. 34), where we read: "To whom is this prince of the Gūrjara, the banner of the Caulukya-race, not known, he who through curiosity wandered alone through the whole world?" etc. Here we have a distinct reference to Kumārāpāla's wanderings. As Yaśodhara wrote in Ajayapāla's reign immediately after Kumārāpāla's death, his testimony has great value. Kumārāpāla's coronation took place certainly in the Vikrama-year 1199, as the *Prabandhas* assert, as Hemacandra (see below, Note 63) gives a similar statement in the *Mahāvīracarita*. The oldest inscription of his reign is that of Maṅgrol-Maṅgalapura, which is dated in the year 1202, *Bhāvanagar Prācīn Sodhasaṅgraha*, pp. 1-10. The day of the event is, according to Merutuṅga's *Vīratrasaṅgi*, Mārgaśīra sudi 4, but according to the *Prabandhasantāmanu* of the same author, p. 194, it is Kārttika vadi 2, Sunday under the Nakṣatra Hasta. Jinamaṇḍana, *Kumārāpālacarita* pp. 58 and 83, names Mārgaśīra sudi 4, Sunday.

56. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 350-417.

57. *Prabandhasantāmanu*, pp. 192-195.

58. *Kumārāpālacarita*, pp. 44-54. The sermon, adorned with many alleged quotations from the Brahmanical literature, is given in full.

59. *Kumārāpālacarita*, pp. 53-83. The meeting of Hemacandra and Udayana is described on pp. 66-70.

60. *Prabhāvakacaritra* XXII, 417-595. The extract is very much lengthened by the insertion of several, mostly irrelevant, tales. In his first speech to the king, 429-458, Vāgbhaṭa weaves in the story of the death of his father Udayana, who accompanied Kumārāpāla's brother Kirtipāla on a campaign against Navaghana, the king of Saṁrāstra, and fell in battle. Then the last campaign against Arjorāja, and the decisive battle are very fully described and the description is much lengthened by the story of an attack tried by Vikramasinha, the Paramāra king of Candravati and Abū against Kumārāpāla. The passage referring to Hemacandra's call, and to the conversion of Kumārāpāla is as follows:—

अन्वेष्टुर्वाग्मदानार्थं धर्मशान्तकवासनः ।

अष्टच्छदाईवाचारोपदेशार्थं गुरुं श्रुतः ॥ ५८१ ॥

सुरे[ः] श्रीहेयमहिमचन्द्रश्च सुगौरवसौरा[म] ।

भोषयदक्षाम[त] विचोयमभ्यामो[प्यात्म]नयमभिर्य ॥ ५८२ ॥

श्रीप्रसादुवचमुक्ते[कि] राजा वामभट्टादिभिः ।

राजवेशम[न्य]नीयन्त सूरयो बहुमानतः ॥ ५८३ ॥

अभ्युत्थाय महीसेन दत्तासन्त्यु[ल्ल]खता उ[प]पादिशत् ।

राजाह सु[सु]गुरो धर्मं दिश जैनं तमोद्धारम् ॥ ५८४ ॥

अथ ईव[त्] च[] दवासूलमाचरन् स सुनीयतः ।

असत्सत्तेनवामक्षपरिग्रहयिर्वर्जनम् ॥ ५८५ ॥

निरामोक्षणमुक्तिश्च मांसाहारस्य हेयता ।

शुतिस्तृप्तिसिद्धिदानवनिगमकर्मति[र] एता ॥ ५८६ ॥

उक्तं च योगशाले ॥ प्रकाश ३, १८-२३].....

इत्यादि सर्वे हेयानां परित्यागमुपादिशत् ।

तथेति यति[कृष्ण] जगद्देवां च निषमाम्बुः ॥ ५९२ ॥

श्रीचैत्यवन्दनस्तोत्र[ं] सुतिमुल्लयमपीववात् ।

वंदनपक्षामणालोचनप्रतिमप्रथकान्वरि[त] ॥ ५९३ ॥

प्रत्यास्थानानि सर्वाणि तथामा[रुत] विचारिका[का] ।
 निरुपमानमाधान्(?) पर्यवेकासन तथा ॥ ५२४ ॥
 मा[चो]द्राचार्यकार चारित्रिस्त्वाम्पनिर्दे[त] ।
 जैन विधि समग्रस्य विरभावद्वयद् यधो[मो] ॥ ५२५ ॥

61 In the *Prabandhaucanana* pp 190-197 Kumarapala battles with his rebellious counsellors on pp 197-199 the campaign against Amoraja and the rewarding of his benefactors on pp 200-201 the adventures of the singer Sallika on pp 201-203 the war against Malharjuna and his fall, on pp 203-206 Hemacandra's introduction to Kumarapala's court and the events immediately following it, on pp 207-217 the building of the temple of Siva Somanatha the pilgrimage to Devapattana and the converse on of the king Udayana's account of Hemacandra's youth is pushed into the latter tale on pp 207-211 see above page 7 The verses which Hemacandra is supposed to have composed in honour of Siva read on p 213 as follows —

यत्र तत्र समये यथा तथा
 योति सोऽभिधया यथा तथा ।
 शीतदोषकटुप स चेद् भवान्
 एक एव भगवन् नमोस्तु ते ॥ १ ॥
 भवभीमाङ्कुरवतना रागाया क्षयमुपगता यस्य ।
 महा या विष्णुर्वा मदेभरो वा नमस्तस्मै ॥ २ ॥

They are the same as were composed according to the *Prabandhaucanana* when Hemacandra visited the place of pilgrimage Devapattana with Siddharaja. The question as to whether they are authentic is difficult to decide. However it is quite possible that on some occasion or other Hemacandra consented in order to please one of his Siva patrons to sing in praise of Siva in so curious a fashion and with a double meaning.

62. *Kumarapalaravita* pp. 81-88

अथ कर्णायला श्रीदेवाचार्यो श्रीरसारथ राज्याक्षि शुभा उदयवमन्त्रिद्वयप्रवेशोत्तरा पत्तने प्रापु । दृष्टो मयी । राजायाक क्षति न वैति । मन्त्रिणोक्तम् । नेति । तत्र कदाचित्सूरिभिरुच्ये । मन्त्रिन् एव यत्र यथा रद । अथ स्वया न राजा गृहे नैव सुख्यम् (५८) राज्ञो सोपसर्गचाप । केनोक्तमिति दृष्टेर्न राजायादे मज्जान धार्यम् । ततो मन्त्रिणा लघोके राजा च तथा कृते निशि विद्युत्पातात्तस्मिन् गृहे दग्धे राज्यो च सुधाया चमत्कृतो राजा जगद् सादरम् । मन्त्रिन् कस्यदभयगतज्ञान दृष्टासनादुपाय वदिस्वर प्राञ्जलिदवाच । भगवन् अह निमास्वमिति दशदिशु नाल तत्रमवताम् । तदा च स्वप्नमोर्षे रक्षितो भवामि । सूरिभिरुच्ये । कथमित्य विज्ञायते स्वनामान सुधा राज्य उपकारपणो यत्ते संप्रति समागतोस्ति । ततो राजाह । भगवन् पूर्वप्रविशुतमिदं राज्यं गृहीत्वा मामनुगृहाण । तत्र सूरि प्रोवाच । राज्यं निरुपमानमाध्याक राज्येन[वि]त् । चेद् परं संह निधेतिर त्वप्रमो(?) न अतो भवन्निरीह प्रसह समग्रस्य प्रसव । एवमग्रीह्य यथाप्राप्य च समायामापत्य धर्मममान्त राणि सूरिराख्यातवान् ॥

63. *Kumarapalaravita* pp 88-137 It may also be mentioned that Jinamandana does not disdain the report of the *Prabandhaucanana* about Kumarapala's 12 years war with Amoraja and the defeat of the latter through the mercy of Ajlanatha. He inserts it later on pp 232 ff without any connection.

64 J Tod *Travels in Western India* p 504. No V.—The extract given there is quite unreliable. The partial translation by Forbes *Journ So Br R A Soc* vol. VIII pp 58-59 is better. An edition of the important inscriptions by Mr Vajeshankar G Ozha appeared in *Wiener Zeitschr f die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. III pp 1 ff. The verse in question reads —

एवं राज्यमनारतं सिद्धयति श्रीवीरसिंहासने
 श्रीमद्वीरकुमारपालशृपतौ त्रैलोक्यकल्पद्रुमे ।
 गण्डो भाववृहस्पतिः स्वर्णिमोस्त्रीदय देवालयं
 जीर्णं भूपतिमाह देवसदनं प्रोदतुमेतद्वचः ॥ २१ ॥

The date of the inscription, Valabhi-Samvat 850, cannot be translated with accuracy, as the day of the week and the month is not stated. However, it corresponds to V. S. 1225, and probably May or June 1169 A. D.

65. *Indian Antiquary*, vol. IV, pp. 267-269.

66. This important passage, to which Prof. H. H. Wilson, *Works*, vol. I, pp. 303 f. (ed. Rost), first called attention, occurs in the *Mahāvīracarika*, Sarga XII, 45-96. I am indebted to Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar for the following copy, which was prepared by Śāstri Vāmanaācārya Jhalkikar from a MS. of the Deccan College Collection bought by me in 1874. The emendations in verses 45, 52, 53, 54, 62, 63, 68, 69, 74, 79, 85, 91 were suggested by the copyist.

अस्मि[स्म]तिवाणतो वर्षशस्त्रा[वा]न्यभय वोदश ।
 नयपष्टिश्च यास्तन्नि यदा वज्र पुरे तदा ॥ ३५ ॥
 कुमारपालभूपालको[शे]तिचयकुलचन्द्रमाः ।
 भविष्यति महाबाहुः प्रचण्डालण्डशासनः ॥ ३६ ॥
 स महात्मा धर्मदानयुद्धवीरः प्रजां जीवात् ।
 ऋद्धिं नेष्यति परमां पितेव परिपालयन् ॥ ३७ ॥
 ऋक्षरप्यतिचतुरः शान्तेऽप्यस्मान्निवस्यतिः ।
 क्षमावानप्यष्टपक्ष स चिरं ह्यमामविष्यति ॥ ३८ ॥
 स क्षामितदसं लोकं धर्मेनिष्ठं करिष्यति ।
 विद्यापूर्णं[धि] उपाप्माय इवान्तेवासिनं हितम् ॥ ३९ ॥
 शरण्यः शरणेष्वृषां परवारीसहोदरः ।
 प्राणेश्वरोपि धनेभ्योपि स धर्मं बहु संसृजे ॥ ४० ॥
 पराक्रमेण धर्मेण दानेन दययाश्रया ।
 अन्यैश्च पुरुषगुणैः सोद्वितीयो भविष्यति ॥ ४१ ॥
 स कैवरीमातुल्यः (क)मैन्द्रीमात्रिदवापगम् ।
 वाग्माताविष्णुमावाधार्पे[धि] पश्चिमां साधविष्यति ॥ ४२ ॥
 क्षम्यता वज्रताजार्वा मुनिचन्द्रकुलोन्नयम् ।
 आचार्यं हेमचन्द्रं स द्रक्ष्यति क्ष[ति]तिनायकः ॥ ४३ ॥
 वरुणनाथं शत्रुदिवः केकीवाग्नुददनेनयत् ।
 तं मुनिं चन्द्रिदं नित्यं स भद्रात्मा त्वरिष्यते ॥ ४४ ॥
 वरुणं शत्रुर्विनचैले कुर्वतो धर्मदेवानम् ।
 राजा सधावकाभालो चन्द्रनाथं भविष्यति ॥ ४५ ॥
 तथ देवं नमस्कृत्य स तत्त्वमाविद्वद्यपि ।
 यन्निदृश्यते तत्तात्पर्यं भावयुद्धेन जेतसा ॥ ४६ ॥
 स श्रुत्वा तन्मुक्तात् प्रीत्या विमुद्धां धर्मेदेवानम् ।
 शत्रुवृत्तानि सम्पन्नत्वपूर्वकाणि प्रपत्स्यते ॥ ४७ ॥
 स प्रासवोषो भविष्य आयकाचारपारगः ।
 शास्त्रानेपि शिखरो धर्मगोष्ठया खं रमयिष्यति ॥ ४८ ॥
 अज्ञाशकफलादीनां स्त्रियमश्वं विरोधतः ।
 आदायते स प्रसहं प्राणिनं महानर्षहृदम् ॥ ४९ ॥

साधारणस्त्रीर्न पर स सुधीर्वर्जयिष्यति ।
 धर्मपत्नीरपि ब्रह्म चरितु बोधयिष्यति ॥ ६० ॥
 मुनेभ्योपदेशेन जीयाजीयादितत्वमित् ।
 आचार्य इव सोन्येयामपि बोधिं प्रदास्यति ॥ ६१ ॥
 येर्द्वय[य]मैन्द्रि[य] केवि पाण्डुरङ्गदिनादयः ।
 तेषु तस्याज्ञया गर्भं धावता इव भाविन ॥ ६२ ॥
 अपृणितेषु चैलेषु गुरव[र]ण्य[र]ण्यतेषु च ।
 न बोधयते स धर्मज्ञ प्रपन्नप्रायश्चित्त ॥ ६३ ॥
 अपुत्रमृतपुत्रा स द्रविणं न गृहीष्यति ।
 त्रिकस्य फल हेतुदृष्टा ह्यविवेकिन ॥ ६४ ॥
 पाण्डुममृतिभिरपि या त्यक्ता मृगया न हि ।
 स स्वयं स्पृश्यति जन सत्वापि च तदाज्ञया ॥ ६५ ॥
 हिंसानियेषके तस्मिन् दूरेषु मृगयादिकम् ।
 अपि मत्तुण्युक्तादीन् नान्यजोपि हतिष्यति ॥ ६६ ॥
 तस्मिन् निषिद्धपापद्वन्द्ववरण्ये मृगजातयः ।
 सदाप्यविमरोमन्या भाविन्यो गोष्ठेषुवत् ॥ ६७ ॥
 जलचरस्थलचरखग[सि]चराणां स देहिनाम् ।
 रक्षिष्यति सदाभारि शासने पाकशासनम्[न] ॥ ६८ ॥
 ये वा[चा]जन्मापि माम्पादास्ते भासस्य[स्य] कथामपि ।
 दुस्त्रममिध तस्याज्ञावशान् नेष्यन्ति विसृष्टिम् ॥ ६९ ॥
 दशार्द्धं परित्यक्त यत्पुरा श्रावकैरपि ।
 तन्मद्यमनपद्यान्मा स सर्वत्र निरोह्यति ॥ ७० ॥
 स तथा मद्यसंघान् निरोह्यति महीतले ।
 न यथा मद्यभाण्डानि घटयिष्यति चक्रयपि ॥ ७१ ॥
 मद्यपान[न] सदा मद्यव्यसनहीणसंपदाम् ।
 तदाज्ञासक्तमद्यानां प्रभविष्यन्ति सपद ॥ ७२ ॥
 मलादिभिरपि क्षमापैर्गुणैर्त्यक्त न यत्पुरा ।
 तस्य स्ववैरिण इव नामाप्युन्मूलयिष्यति ॥ ७३ ॥
 पारावतपण्डीडाकुर्कु[क]द्वयोपनान्वयि ।
 न भविष्यन्ति मेदिन्यां तस्मोदयिनि शासने ॥ ७४ ॥
 प्रायेण स प्रतिग्राममपि नि सीमवैभव ।
 करिष्यति महीमेतां जिनायतनमण्डिताम् ॥ ७५ ॥
 प्रतिग्रामं प्रतिपुरमासमुद्र महीतले ।
 रथवाज्रोत्सव सोर्द्धम[म]तिमान् करिष्यति ॥ ७६ ॥
 दायदार्थं ब्रजिणानि विरचय्यादूण जगत् ।
 अङ्गविष्यति मेदिन्यां स संवरसरमात्मनः ॥ ७७ ॥
 प्रतिग्रामपाशु[पाशु]गुहा तं कपिलर्विप्रनिष्ठिताम् ।
 एकदा शोषयति कथाप्रसङ्गे तु गुरोर्मुखात् ॥ ७८ ॥
 पांशु[सु]खल खानयित्वा प्रतिमा विधपाति[व]नीम् ।
 आनेष्यामीति स वदा करिष्यति अनोरथम् ॥ ७९ ॥
 सदैव[तदेव]मननुत्साहं निमित्तान्यपराण्यपि ।
 ज्ञात्वा निषेधते राजा प्रतिमां हस्तगामिनीम् ॥ ८० ॥
 ततो गुरुमनुज्ञाप्य नियोग्यायुक्तपीठ्यात् ।
 प्रारब्धते खानयितुं स्थल कीर्तनयस्य तत् ॥ ८१ ॥

सत्वेन तस्य परमाहृतस्य दृष्टिधीपतेः ।
 करिष्यति [तु] संनिष्यं तदा शासनदेवता ॥ ८२ ॥
 राज्ञः कुमारपालस्य तस्य पुण्येन भूयसा ।
 खन्यमाने स्थले शु[म]ङ्कु प्रतिनाभिर्भविष्यति ॥ ८३ ॥
 तदा तस्य प्रतिमायै यदुदायनमुपुजा ।
 ग्रामाणां शासनं दत्तं वदप्याभिर्भविष्यति ॥ ८४ ॥
 नृपायुष्महो प्रतिमां भद्रा[ह]मपि नवामिव ।
 रथमारोपयिष्यन्ति पूजयित्वा यथाविधि ॥ ८५ ॥
 पूजाप्रकारेणैव पवि जायमानेषु अनेकशः ।
 कियमाजेष्वहोरात्रं संगीतेषु निरन्तरम् ॥ ८६ ॥
 तालिकारासिकेष्वैर्भवति [भवत्सु] ग्रामयोषिताम् ।
 पद्मशन्देर्वातोयेषु वाद्यमानेषु संमदात् ॥ ८७ ॥
 पक्ष्मये चामरेष्वतसु च पतसु च ।
 नेप्यन्ति सम[प्र]तिमां वा युक्ताः पञ्चवर्तीनि ॥ ८८ ॥

प्रतिनिर्दिशेयकम् ॥

साग्नःपुरपरीवारधनुस्त्रयमुद्धतः ।
 सकलं संप्रमादाय राजा रामभिरालयति ॥ ८९ ॥
 स्वर्गं रथात्समुत्तीर्य गजेन्द्रमभिस्तप्य च ।
 प्रवेशयिष्यति पुरे प्रतिमां वा स भूयतिः ॥ ९० ॥
 उपस्वशु[म]वनं श्रीज्ञानवने संनिषेय्य ताम् ।
 कुमारपाले विधिवत् त्रिसंघं पूजयिष्यति ॥ ९१ ॥
 प्रतिमायाश्चैवा उक्ता वाचयित्वा स शासनम् ।
 उक्ता[कु]यनेन यदुक्तं तत् प्रमाणीकरीष्यति ॥ ९२ ॥
 प्रास्तादोद्यपदसैव युवराजः[ज] स कारितः ।
 जनविश्वस्यसंभार्यो विस्मयं जगद्योपि हि ॥ ९३ ॥
 स भूयतिः प्रतिमया तत्र स्थापितव्या तया ।
 दृष्टिवत् प्रतापेन कृद्वा निःश्रेयसेन च ॥ ९४ ॥
 देवमन्त्रा गुरुचक्रया स्ववितुः सद्योभय ।
 कुमारपाले भूपालः स भविष्यति याते ॥ ९५ ॥
 इति श्रुत्वा नमस्कृत्य भगवन्प्रसादायः ।
 उपश्रो[शि]लिकमागल्य चक्रुर्मेवं प्रचक्षते ॥ ९६ ॥

The date in the first verse is of extraordinary interest. It shows distinctly that Hemacandra, like the other *S'vetāmbaras*, put the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvīra 470 years before the beginning of the Vikrama era. For only 1669-470 gives the right date V. S. 1199 for the beginning of Kumārāpāla's reign. Jacobi, *Kalpavṛkṣa*, p. 8, has called attention to the fact that Hemacandra's statements in the *Paris'ṭaparivāṇa* do not coincide with the usual calculation. The coronation of Candragupta is there, VIII, 339, placed 165 years after the Nirvāṇa, whereas the old *Gāthās* add another sixty years. The latter say that Mahāvīra died in the night when Pālaka was crowned. According to them, Pālaka reigned 60 years, the Nandas 165, and between Candragupta's coronation and the beginning of the Vikrama-era, 255 years passed. Upon this Jacobi based two hypotheses, firstly that Hemacandra, having referred to a better tradition, left out the sixty years of Pālaka, and secondly that he placed the Nirvāṇa, 410 years before the beginning of the Vikrama era, in the year 467/66 B. C. I do not think that these deductions are tenable. For, according to the *Paris'ṭaparivāṇa* VI, 243:

अनन्तरं चर्धमानस्यानिर्दिष्टायासरात् ।

नवम्यां दष्टितसर्वांशेषु नन्दोन्नवहृदः ॥

Nanda I ascended the throne 60 years after Mahāvīra's death. The calculation of the *Parisāṣṭapāraṇa* is therefore thus from the Nirvana up to Nanda I sixty years, from Nanda I's coronation up to Candragupta's coronation 95 years or a total of 155. From this, Jacobs's first premise is proved wrong. As regards the second one, it has so far not been proved that Hemacandra, like the *Gāthās*, placed only 255 years between Candragupta and the beginning of the Vikrama-era. The circumstance that, according to the *Mahāvīracarita*, the Nirvana took place 470 years before Vikrama, makes it probable, (unless there is a careless mistake in the *Parisāṣṭapāraṇa*) that Hemamandra or his authority counted 315 years between Candragupta's coronation and the beginning of the Vikrama-Samvat and similarly, like the Ceylonese Buddhists placed the former event too early. For this reason, it seems to me that the assumption of the Svetāmbaras of the 12th century having two dates, 597/6 and 467/6 B C for Vardhamana's Nirvana, is not likely. In Note 15 to my lecture about the Jains, p. 38 of the separate reprint, I have shown that the date 467/66 B C for Vardhamana's death cannot be correct, if Sakyamuni Gautama died about 477 B C.

67. The statement that Vagbhata was a minister of Kumārāpāla is found in the *Kumārāpāla-prasasti*, verse 87, see Peterson *Third Report* App. p. 316. This point is of some importance. For Vagbhata does not occur in the inscriptions of Kumārāpāla's reign, which have so far been made known. However as the *Prasasti* is by a pupil of Hemacandra's its statement deserves credence. The *Prabdhakāśikā* XXII 676 mentions V S 1213 as the year of the consecration of the temple at Sātrufajya, the *Prabandhacintamani*, p. 219, V S 1211. The *Kumārāpālacarita* p. 181 agrees with the latter work.

The date of the consecration of Amrabbata's temple in Erroch occurs in the *Kumārāpālacarita*, p. 185.

68. The extract from the *Maharajapardjaya* in which amongst others the last verse, *ś'ri-ś'vetambara Hemacandra-vacasaṁ* etc. quoted by Kielhorn, *Report of 1880-81*, occurs begins in the *Kumārāpālacarita* p. 161 line 14 and ends on p. 177, line 1. The passage in question is to be found on p. 167, lines 17 ff., where we read -

अथ समासे शुभलेने निर्मलभाववारीनि हृमद्भलमन्त्र सखीर्विचन्दनावलितदेह [१०] वैकाशिमहोत्सवपु-
ण्यलङ्कृत [१०] दानकङ्कणोचित्युदक्षिणपानि स्वयंराग्न[ग]नधिरुद्ध सदाचारप्रपञ्चोचित श्रद्धासहोदराया क्रियमाणल-
घ्नोत्तरनिधि १३ शत्रुकोटिमतमहामुमगन्धलोकरिदृष्ट भीदेवगुरुमहिदेवधिरिति यानिनीमि (१) गीर्णमानधवलमद्गल क्रमेण
प्राप्त वीरभागाद्द्वारोत्थेष्टप्रविशसत्पायवपणमयातोषधिरूपे प्रत्येति विनिधिरुवा कृत्तमेष्टुयाचार शमदमादिना [२] लक-
दधिततरनिर्मलपुद्गलमप्यतिताया सीलभनलवीरभानन्दपुद्गल [३] पदुरि (१) लोमेदुदुदिकाचलकृताया कृपसुन्दर्यो स०
१२१६ मार्ग शु० ३ दिने पालि जमाद भीकुमारपाल । भीमदेदे [४] रीजवतमक्ष लत श्यागमोक्तमादपुण्यगुणिवद्वादसमत्कल-
शावलि विचारवास्तोर्णा नवतवनमज्जवेदी कृपा प्रकोषमिसुदाम्य [५] दुरीण्य भागजासर्विलपि श्रीदेवाचार्यो भूदेव सपुष्ट
द्वय [६] दण्ड [७] क्षिण्यमास ॥

69. The MS. in question is described by Peterson *Third Report* App. I, p. 67. The inscription is the presentation of land by the *Mahāmandalika* Pratapaasunha which is preserved in the temple of *Paravandha* in Nādula-Nāmdol. The beginning of the same reads, according to the copy which I made in 1873

॥ ॐ संवत् १२१३ वर्षे माघे यदि १० शुक्ले ॥ भीमदण्डिलपाठके समस्ततानावलितसमलंकृतपरमभट्टारकमा-
राजप्राज्ञपरमेश्वर-उमापतिरत्नचमरादमीडमपनिजमुनिरुचिरभार्यापयनिजिनिह शास्त्रपरीभूपालभीमदण्डिलपाठकेवकस्यापविज-
यराये । सत्पादोपनीमि महामालवीभावादेदेवे श्रीभीकरणपदो सकलमुद्रावपाराद् परिषययति

As the inscription contains a presentation to the Jains one might surely expect a mention of Kumārāpāla's conversion in case the same had already taken place before that time. The exact date of this is, according to Dr. Schram's calculation, January 20th, 1156, a Friday

69a. The *Alamkaracudamani* is written in *Sūtras*, and is provided with a very clear, detailed

commentary, containing a large number of examples to illustrate the rules. The work consists of eight *Adhyāyas*, the contents of which is as follows:-

- I. *Mangala*, Purpose of Poetry, Qualifications of the poet, the Nature of Poetry, the three *śāktas* of the word, pp. 1-48.
- II. The doctrine of the *Rasas*, pp. 49-96.
- III. The errors of poetic composition, pp. 97-169.
- IV. The advantages of poetic composition, pp. 169-174.
- V. The *Sablānakāras*, pp. 175-200.
- VI. The *Arthalanikāras*, pp. 201-250.
- VII. The suitable characters for poetic presentation, pp. 251-279.
- VIII. The kinds of poetic composition, pp. 280-291.

The MS. which I used, is India Office Library (*Sanskrit-MSS.*, Buhler) No. 111. It was put together by Śāstri Vāmanācārya Jhalakīkar, after a comparison of several old MSS.

70. See *Vāghatālanikāra*, ed. Borooah, IV, 45, 70, 81, 85, 125, 129, 132, 152.

In the fifth and eighth passages Jayasinha's victory over Varvaraka or Barbaraka is mentioned, which is spoken about in the *Dvyāśrayakāvya* and in the *Canukya*-inscriptions.

71. About the Berlin-MS. of *Chandanaśāstra* or *Chandas'cūdāmanī*, see Weber, *Katalog*, vol. II, sect. I, p. 268. We must add to his description that the leaves 27, 29-31, 36-40, show, besides the usual figures on the left, the symbols of the old *aṣṭarāpallī*. The Commentary on the small work is very detailed and contains, according to the colophon of the Jessalmir MS. 4100 *Granthas*. I had no MS. of the latter at my disposal for this work. My remarks are based upon notes previously taken.

72. *Alankāraśūdhāmanī*, III, 2 has, in explanation of the error:

एवदत्तव । एवदत्तवदत्तु स्वच्छन्दोत्तमनेऽस्मानिर्निरूपित इति नेह मत्तन्वते ।

73. The *Śeśākhya Nānamālā* is reprinted in Böhtlingk and Rieu's edition of *Abhidhāna-śīlāmānī*. As regards the Berlin MSS. see Weber, *Katalog*, vol. II, sect. I, pp. 258 f. The work agrees to a very remarkable extent with the older *Vaijayanī* of Yādava-prakāśa's, from which a number of rare words has been borrowed.

74. The *Nighantū* is mentioned in the list of Hemacandra's works at the end of the *Prathāvala-caritra* under the name *Nirghāṇṭa*. We read there, XXII, 836-40:

व्याकरण[ं] पद्याद्वं प्रमाणसाक्ष[ं] प्रमाणमीमांसा[क्षम्] ।
छन्दोर्लक्षितचूडामणी च वाच्ये विमुक्तपित्तः[पित्त] ॥ ८३६ ॥
पञ्चायनेकार्थो देश्या विचिष्ट इति च फावातः ।
विहितान्न वा[ता]मकोताः शुक्तिदिग्गजपुष्पाद्याः ॥ ८३७ ॥
स्यु[त्सु]चरापटिगलाकान्तरेतिदृष्टं गृह्यतविचारे ।
अप्यात्मयोगसाक्षं विदधे जगदुपकृतिविपित्तुः ॥ ८३८ ॥
लक्षणसाहित्यगुणं विदधे च व्यासप[द्य] महाकाम्यम् ।
चक्रे विंशतिमुच्चैः स वीतरागलवार्त्ता च ॥ ८३९ ॥
इति तद्विहितग्रन्थसंहयेव न हि विपद्ये ।
नामानि न विदन्त्येवार्था[नि] साक्षात् मन्दनेपसः ॥ ८४० ॥

s regards the fragments found, see my *Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts*

1874/75, pp. 6 f., and the List of the *Alphinstone College Collection 1866/68* under *Kosha*. There is a copy of the *Nighantusya, dhanyatinda*, in the *Dacca College Collection 1875/77*, No 735

75 The verses in which Kumārāpala is named, are found in Fischel's edition (*Bombay Sanskrit Series* No XVII) I, 87, 107, 116, 127, II, 39, 80, III, 46, IV, 16, VI, 10, 19, 26, VII, 7, 13, 40, 53. Those addressed to Culekka or Calukka are— I, 66 84, II, 80, VI, 5, 7, 15, 17, 111, VII, 51 We may also remark that Jayasinha Siddharaja is named in one single verse II, 4, and that his victory over Barbaraka is mentioned.

The verse IV, 32 perhaps refers to the same king—
 "O earthly tree of Paradise, O thou, whose strong arm is like unto a tree, the gutters of the houses in Paithāna are filled with the sap of the strength of thy elephants."

Bhāndārkar has recently discovered fragments of a historical work, which speaks of a conquest of Pratisthana-Paithān by Jayasinha see *Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts of 1893-94* p 10 It is also possible that Hala Sātavahana is meant by the earthly tree of Paradise, as his name also occurs otherwise in the *Desanāmamala*

76 *Prabandhaśatīkāmā*, pp 225-226 relates that Kumārāpala was guilty of a linguistic solecism, when he used the word *aupamyā* instead of *upama* or *aupamyam*. Then, we are told, he studied the *Sāstras* beginning with the *mātrkapāṭha* with some Pandit or other. In one year he absolved three *Kavyas* with the Commentaries and then received the title of honour *Vicāracaeturmulika*. The same story occurs in the *Kumārāpalacarita* p 105, where Hemacandra is mentioned as the teacher.

77 An interesting proof of the significance of Jainism in Anhilvad before Hemacandra's time is furnished by the discovery of the drama *Karnasundari*, which was recently published by Pandit Durgāprasāda in the *Bombay Kavyamala*. The piece was written by the famous poet Bilhana, and was intended to be acted in the temple of Santinath at the feast of Nābhaya, which was instituted by the minister Saṃpāthara (Santu?). The first verse of the Nāndi, an imitation of the beginning of the *Nagānanda*, is therefore addressed to the Jina. The hero as stated by the poet in Act I, verse 10 himself, is the son of Bhūmadeva, a king Karna, who reigned from V S 1120 to 1150. Other evidence of the influence of the Jainas at the court of Anhilvad may be found in the *Prasasti* of the old MSS. where many Jainas are mentioned as occupying official positions under the first Caulukyas, especially in the department of finance.

78. The story is found in *Kumārāpalacarita* pp 137 ff., and its contents are as follows—
 When Kumārāpala was inclined towards Jainism the Brahmins called in Rajacārya Devabodhi. This was a great Yogi, who had made the goddess Bhārati submissive to him, and was acquainted with sorcery and knew the past and the future. After the king had heard that Devabodhi had come into the neighbourhood of Anhilvada, he received him with great honour, and led him to his palace. The greater part of the day passed in ceremonies of reception. In the afternoon the king worshipped the picture of S'antinātha in the presence of the whole court. Then Devabodhi admonished him to desert from the Jaina faith. When Kumārāpala praised the latter on account of the Ahimsa doctrine and blamed the Śrauta Dharma on account of the Hindu, Devabodhi caused the gods Brahman, Viṣṇu and Śiva, as well as the seven Caulukya-princes—Malaraja and his successors—to appear; and they of course did Devabodhi's feats. At first he caused his seat to be pulled away, and then executed the trick which was supposed to be a great favourite amongst the Yogis, namely, that of holding himself up in mid air. Then he caused the entire Olympus of the Jainas to appear before the king, together with all the king's ancestors, who worshipped the Jinas. Finally he explained that the apparitions were only an illusion, just as those produced by Devabodhi had been. Only that which Somanātha had told the king in the temple of Devapattana was the truth. This of course assured his victory. Regarding Devabodhi, who was probably a historical personage, see also above, page 20.

79. Merutunga's statement is quoted above, page 80 and Note 61. He says wrongly that the *Triśaṣṭisādhāpurāṣcaritā* was written before the *Yogasāstra*. This statement is repeated by Jīnamardana. The *Prabhāvakāraṇī* XXII, 775 ff. and 899 ff. gives the date of the two works as much later, but it puts the *Yogasāstra* first.

80. The first four *Prakāśas* of the *Yogasāstra* are known through E. Windisch's edition and translation in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. XXVIII, pp. 185 ff. The contents of the last eight *Prakāśas*, which are preserved only in very few MSS. are as follows:-

Prakāśa V, about certain exercises belonging to the Yoga and their results, as they are taught by others, according to the Commentary of Patañjali and others. To these belong 1) the *Prāṇāyāma*, by which one learns how to control the winds of the body and the *Manas*, s'l. 1-25, 2) the *Dhāraṇā*, by which one learns how to conduct the winds into any parts of the body one likes, and to draw them out again, s'l. 20-35, 3) the observation of the movements of the winds in the body, by which one can foretell death and life, fortune and misfortune, s'l. 36-120, 4) other methods of predetermining the death through meditation and divination, s'l. 121-224, 5) methods of determining victory and defeat, success or failure of undertakings and so forth, s'l. 225-251, 6) the cleansing of the *Nāḍīs*, the arteries, which are the paths of the wind, s'l. 252-263, 2) the *Veikaviddhī* and *Parapurapraveśa*, the art of separating the soul from the body and of causing it to enter other bodies, s'l. 264-273,

Prakāśa VI, s'lokas 7, about the fatality of *Parapurapraveśa* and *Prāṇāyāma* for gaining salvation, - for which purpose, however, the *Pratyāhāra* taught by some is useful, - and about the parts of the body which come into question for meditation (*dhyāna*).

Prakāśa VII, s'lokas 28, the *Pinḍastha Dhyāna*, the meditation about bodies, with its five sub-divisions called *Dhāraṇā*, viz., the *Pārthivī*, *Āgneyī*, *Māruti*, *Vāruṇī* and *Tatrabhī*, see Bhāṇḍārkar, *Report of 1883/84*, pp. 110-111.

Prakāśa VIII, s'lokas 78, the *Padastha Dhyāna*, the meditation on sacred words or syllables, which one imagines as written upon lotus-leaves, (see Bhāṇḍārkar, *loc. cit.* p. 111).

Prakāśa IX, s'lokas 15, the *Rūpastha Dhyāna*, the meditation on the form of Arhat, (see Bhāṇḍārkar, *loc. cit.* p. 112).

Prakāśa X, s'lokas 24, (1) the *Rūpātīta Dhyāna*, the meditation on the formless *Paramarman*, which is only intelligence and rapture, i. e. the released soul, with which one identifies oneself, thereby making oneself like unto it; (2) another division of meditation, in 4 parts, namely, *Ājñādhyāna*, *Apāyavicyādhyāna*, *Vipāyavicyādhyāna* and *Saṁsthānadhyāna*.

Prakāśa XI, s'lokas 61, the *S'ūktā Dhyāna*; see Bhāṇḍārkar, *loc. cit.* p. 110.

Prakāśa XII, s'lokas 55, concluding remarks of the author, based upon his own experience, upon that which is especially necessary to the *Yogī* and leads him to salvation.

It is now easily understood why this part of the work, which is really the part which justifies the title, has not been much copied, whilst the MSS. of the first four *Prakāśas* are even now often explained to laymen as a text-book for their duties.

The Commentary to the *Yogasāstra* was written by Hamaçandra after the completion of the text as well as of the *Vitarāgaśāstra*, which, according to the *Prabandhas*, belonged to the *Yoga-sāstra*, (Note 81). For verses of the latter (i. e. the *Vitarāgaśāstra*) are often quoted, e. g. II, 7; III, 123; IV, 108; and the last verse of the *Yogasāstra* even in the explanation of I, 4.

The explanation of the first four *Prakāśas* is extraordinarily detailed. The words of the text are expounded by very numerous quotations, and the stories, to which allusion is made, are related at great length. It is especially interesting that the legend of Śhūlabhadra in III, 131 is given in almost exactly the same words as in the *Parīśiṣṭaparva* VIII, 2-193 and IX, 55-111a, without, however,

1874/75 pp. 6 f. and the Last of the *Elphinstone College Collection 1866/68* under *Kosha* There is a copy of the *Nighan-us-qa dhanyal anda* in the *Deccan College Collection 1875/77*, No 735

75 The verses in which Kumārāpala is named, are found in Pischel's edition (*Bombay Sanskrit Series* No XVII) I, 97 107 116 127, II 39 40, III 40, IV 10, VI 10 19 23, VII 7 13 40 53 Those addressed to Cāṇḍika or Cāṇḍika are.—I 68 84, II 30, VI, 5 7 15 17 111 VIII 51 We may also remark that Jayasinha-Siddhārāja is named in one single verse II 4 and that his victory over Barbarska is mentioned.

The verse IV 32 perhaps refers to the same king —
'O earthly tree of Paradise O thou whose strong arm is like unto a tree the gutters of the houses in Paṭṭhāna are filled with the sap of the strength of thy elephants'

Bhāṇḍārkar has recently discovered fragments of a historical work which speaks of a conquest of Prasthāna-Paithā by Jayasinha see *Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts of 1883-84* p 10 It is also possible that Hala-Satavahana is meant by the earthly tree of Paradise, as his name also occurs otherwise in the *Devaṇamānava*

76 Prabandhacintāmaṇi, pp 225 226 relates that Kumārāpala was guilty of a linguistic solecism when he used the word *anpamyā* instead of *apama* or *anpamyam*. Then we are told, he studied the *Sāstras* beginning with the *mātrikāpāṭha* with some Pandit or other In one year he absorbed three *Kavyas* with the Commentaries, and then received the title of honour *Vicārācāturmuṣṭha*. The same story occurs in the *Kumārāpalarīti* p 165 where Hemacandra is mentioned as the teacher

77 An interesting proof of the significance of Jainism in Anhilvād before Hemacandra's time is furnished by the discovery of the drama *Karnasundarī* which was recently published by Pandit Durgaprasāda in the *Bombay Kavyamālā*. The piece was written by the famous poet Bilihana and was intended to be acted in the temple of Śāntināth at the feast of Nābhaya which was instituted by the minister Sampatkara (Śāntuṭ). The first verse of the Nābhaya an imitation of the beginning of the *Nagānanda* is therefore addressed to the Jina. The hero as stated by the poet in Act I verse 10 him self, is the son of Bhūmadeva i. e. king Karnas who reigned from V S 1120 to 1150 Other evidence of the influence of the Jainas at the court of Anhilvād may be found in the *Prasthāna* of the old MSS. where many Jainas are mentioned as occupying official positions under the first Caulukyas especially in the department of finance.

78. The story is found in *Kumārāpalarīti* pp. 137 ff. and its contents are as follows.—When Kumārāpala was inclined towards Jainism the Brahmins called in Rajacārja Devabodhi. This was a great Yogi who had made the goddess Bhārati submissive to him and was acquainted with sorcery and knew the past and the future. After the king had heard that Devabodhi had come into the neighbourhood of Anhilvād he received him with great honour, and led him to his palace. The greater part of the day passed in ceremonies of reception. In the afternoon the king worshipped a picture of Śāntināth in the presence of the whole court. Then Devabodhi admonished him to desert from the Jain faith. When Kumārāpala praised the latter on account of the Ahimsā doctrine and blamed the Śrauta Dharma on account of the Himsā Devabodhi caused the gods Brahma Viṣṇu and Śiva as well as the seven Caulukya-princes—Mulazaya and his successors—to appear and they of course spoke in favour of the religion of the Vedas. On the following morning Hemacandra considerably out-did Devabodhi's feats. At first he caused his seat to be pulled away and then executed the trick which was supposed to be a great favourite amongst the Yogis, namely that of holding himself up in mid-air. Then he caused the entire Olympus of the Jainas to appear before the king together with all the kings and ancestors who worshipped the Jinas. Finally he explained that the apparitions were only an illusion just as those produced by Devabodhi had been. Only that which Somanātha had told the king in the temple of Devapattana was the truth. This of course assured his victory. Regarding Devabodhi, who was probably a historical personage see also above page 20

70. Merutunga's statement is quoted above, page 30 and Note 61. He says wrongly that the *Triṣaṣṭisālakāpuraṣācarita* was written before the *Yogasāstra*. This statement is repeated by *Jinamandana*. The *Prabhāvakāśastras* XXII, 775 ff and 890 ff gives the date of the two works as much later, but it puts the *Yogasāstra* first.

80. The first four *Prakāśas* of the *Yogasāstra* are known through E. Windisch's edition and translation in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. XXVIII, pp. 185 ff. The contents of the last eight *Prakāśas*, which are preserved only in very few MSS. are as follows:-

Prakāśa V, about certain exercises belonging to the Yoga and their results, as they are taught by others, according to the Commentary of Patanjali and others. To these belong 1) the *Prāṇāyāma*, by which one learns how to control the winds of the body and the *Manas*, s.l. 1-25, 2) the *Dhāraṇā*, by which one learns how to conduct the winds into any parts of the body one likes, and to draw them out again, s.l. 26-35, 3) the observation of the movements of the winds in the body, by which one can foretell death and life, fortune and misfortune, s.l. 36-120, 4) other methods of predetermining the death through meditation and divination, s.l. 121-224, 5) methods of determining victory and defeat, success or failure of undertakings and so forth, s.l. 225-251, 6) the cleansing of the *Nāḍis*, the arteries, which are the paths of the wind, s.l. 252-263, 2) the *Valhavidhāt* and *Parapurapraveśa*, the art of separating the soul from the body and of causing it to enter other bodies, s.l. 264-278.

Prakāśa VI, s.l. 7, about the futility of *Parapurapraveśa* and *Prāṇāyāma* for gaining salvation, - for which purpose, however, the *Pratyāhāra* taught by some is useful, - and about the parts of the body which come into question for meditation (*dhyāna*).

Prakāśa VII, s.l. 23, the *Pañdashu Dhyāna*, the meditation about bodies, with its five sub-divisions called *Dhāraṇā*, viz., the *Pūrṣu*, *Āgneyi*, *Māruti*, *Vāruṣi* and *Tatrabha*, see Bhāṇḍārkar, *Report of 1883/84*, pp. 110-111.

Prakāśa VIII, s.l. 78, the *Paśastha Dhyāna*, the meditation on sacred words or syllables, which one imagines as written upon lotus-leaves, (see Bhāṇḍārkar, *loc. cit.* p. 111).

Prakāśa IX, s.l. 15, the *Rūpastha Dhyāna*, the meditation on the form of Arhat, (see Bhāṇḍārkar, *loc. cit.* p. 112).

Prakāśa X, s.l. 24, (1) the *Rūpātita Dhyāna*, the meditation on the formless *Paramātmā*, which is only intelligence and rapture, i. e. the released soul, with which one identifies oneself, thereby making oneself like unto it; (2) another division of meditation, in 4 parts, namely, *Ājñādhyaṇa*, *Apāyavicayadhyaṇa*, *Vipākavicayadhyaṇa* and *Samsthānadhyaṇa*.

Prakāśa XI, s.l. 61, the *S'ukla Dhyāna*; see Bhāṇḍārkar, *loc. cit.* p. 110.

Prakāśa XII, s.l. 55, concluding remarks of the author, based upon his own experience, upon that which is especially necessary to the Yogi and leads him to salvation.

It is now easily understood why this part of the work, which is really the part which justifies the title, has not been much copied, whilst the MSS. of the first four *Prakāśas* are even now often explained to laymen as a text-book for their duties.

The Commentary to the *Yogasāstra* was written by Hamaçandra after the completion of the text as well as of the *Vitarāgaśāstra*, which, according to the *Prabandhas*, belonged to the *Yogasāstra*, (Note 81). For verses of the latter (i. e. the *Vitarāgaśāstra*) are often quoted, e. g. II, 7; III, 123; IV, 103; and the last verse of the *Yogasāstra* even in the explanation of I, 4.

The explanation of the first four *Prakāśas* is extraordinarily detailed. The words of the text are expounded by very numerous quotations, and the stories, to which allusion is made, are related at great length. It is especially interesting that the legend of *Sthūlabhadra* in III, 131 is given in almost exactly the same words as in the *Parīṣṭaparāṣa* VIII, 2-193 and IX, 56-111a, without, however,

where being any mention of the existence of the latter work. Amongst Hamacandra's own works quotations are taken, generally with the mention *yad avocāma* or *yad uktaṃ asmābhiḥ*, from the Grammar, the *Dhātupāṭha*, the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* and the *Laṅkānuśāsana* besides the *Viśārāgastotra*. In addition, the Commentary often gives appended explanations of the author in the case of difficult points, which are introduced with the words *atīntāre ālolaḥ*. At the end of the Commentary on *Prakāśa* IV there is a verse hinting that the first main section has been concluded:

इति निगदितमेवसाधनं ध्यानसिद्धे-
यंतितृहिगतमेवादेव स्वययं च ।
राखलमपि यदस्यद् ध्यानभेदादि तस्यह
प्रकटितमुपरिष्ठादष्टभिस्तत् प्रकाशो ॥

The conclusion of the work, XII, 55 reads thus:

या शास्त्रासुपुरोमुंसादनुभवाच्चज्ञावि किंचित् कचिद्
योगस्योपनिषद् सिद्धेकपरिषद्येवमकारिणी ।
धीचौलुब्धकुमारपालनुरतेरत्यर्थेनभ्यर्चनाद्
आचार्येण निवेदिता एवि गिरा श्रीहेमचन्द्रेण सा ॥ ५५ ॥

या योगस्योपनिषद् हस्तमज्ञावि शता । कुतः । शास्त्राद् इदंशास्त्रम् । सुपुरोः सदागमव्याप्यासुंसात् साक्षादुपदे-
शात् । अनुभवस्य स्वसंवेदनस्यात् । किंचित् कचिदिति स्वप्रशान्तुसारये । कचिदित्येकत्र सर्वत्र शास्त्रमशक्यत्वात्पदेसावेदे कचन ।
उपनिषद् विहितेति । विवेकिनां योगरक्षीनां वा परिपक्वता कस्या चक्षेत्राच्चनलकरोतीत्येवंदीला सा योगोपनिषद् । श्रीचौलुब्धो
यः कुमारपालनुरतिष्ठत्वात्त्यर्थेनभ्यर्चना । स हि योगोपासनप्रियो षट्योगशास्त्राचार्यः..... यो योगशास्त्रेभ्यो नि..... योगशास्त्रं
शुश्रूषमायः..... सर्वेनरो यचनल..... गिरा एवि निवेदिता[त्वा]त् आचार्यो हेमचन्द्र इति शुभम् ॥

श्रीचौलुब्धपरितरितिकृत्तुप्रार्थनाप्रेरितोऽहं
स्व[त्]स्वशान्तानामुत्तमजलनिषेधेपंगशाखल दृष्टिम् ।
सोपयुक्तं व्यचरयामि[मां तावत्] एषा च नन्याद्
पादजनप्रोवचनवती भूयैव स्व[त्]वीर्यम् ॥ १ ॥
संप्रापि योगशास्त्रादिद्वित्रैश्चापि यमया मुकृत्वम् ।
त्रेव त्रिनपेथिलमनमयी भव्यो जने भवयात् ॥ २ ॥

Then follows the famous Colophon. The MS which I have before me, belonging to the library of the Vienna University, contains 107 leaves with 19 lines on each page. Unfortunately the last page has suffered greatly through use, and cannot be completely deciphered. The date seems to be missing. However, the very archaic script makes it probable that the MS is about 300-400 years old. The *Granthāgāras* of the single *Prakāśas* are Pr. I=2000, Pr. II=3500, Pr. III=3900, Pr. IV=2300; Pr. V=640, Pr. VI=18; Pr. VII=39, Pr. VIII=149, Pr. IX=21, Pr. X=84, Pr. XI=210; Pr. XII, illegible. It is also added that the *Granthasamīkhyā* of the last eight *Prakāśas* is 1500 and that of the whole is 12,000, which cannot be quite correct. Old MSS. of the work are described in Dr. Peterson's *First Report*, App. 22, 57 and in *Third Report*, App. 14, 15, 74, 143, 176. The oldest, death.

81. According to a MS. which was recently sent to me from Bombay the *Viśārāgastotra* consists of twenty quite short sections, each of which bears the name *stava* or *prakāśa*:

1) *Prachīnanāśarāṭh*, 8 *ślokas*, begins:

य. परमा परं ज्योतिः परमः परमेष्टिताम् ।
आदित्यवर्णं वमसः सुरसादाननञ्जि यम् ॥ १ ॥

2) *Sahajātusūyastavah*, 9 *s'lokas*, begins:

भीहिमचन्द्रप्रमवाद् धीतरायसवादितः ।

कुमारपालमूपाः प्रामोतु फलमीप्सितम् ॥ १ ॥

3) *Karmasayajātistavah*, 15 *s'lokas*.

4) *Surakṛtāḥśayastavah*, 14 *s'lokas*.

5) *Pratihāryastavah*, 9 *s'lokas*.

6) *Prātipalsanirāsastavah*, 12 *s'lokas*.

7) *Jagatkartṛnirāsastavah*, 8 *s'lokas*.

8) *Ekāntanirāsastavah*, 12 *s'lokas*.

9) *Kakistavah*, 8 *s'lokas*.

10) *Adbhutastavah*, 8 *s'lokas*.

11) *Mahitastavah*, 8 *s'lokas*.

12) *Vatṛāgyastavah*, 8 *s'lokas*.

13) *Hetunirāsastavah*, 8 *s'lokas*.

14) *Yogasiddhistavah*, 8 *s'lokas*.

15) *Bhaktistavah*, 8 *s'lokas*.

16) *Ātmagarhāstavah*, 9 *s'lokas*.

17) *Saranagamanastavah*, 8 *s'lokas*.

18) *Kathoroktistavah*, 10 *s'lokas*.

19) *Ājñastavah*, 8 *s'lokas*.

20) *Ās'tavah*, 8 *s'lokas*; it ends:

तत्र प्रेयोऽसि दासोऽसि सेवकोऽस्यसि किंकरः ।

ओमिति प्रतिपद्यस्व नाथ नाथः परं भुवे ॥ ८ ॥

The stotra is a short poetic compendium of the Jaina-doctrine, and may have been Hemacandra's first attempt to acquaint Kumārāpāla with the teachings of Jainism.

82. *Indian Antiquary*, vol. IV, pp. 268-269.

83. The story of Yūkavihāra is to be found in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* p. 232, and that of the punishment of Lakṣa in the *Prabhāvakacarita* XXII, 823-830. Kelhana of Naddūla is a historical personage, and is mentioned in an inscription of V. S. 1218, see above, page 88. The issue of the edict of Amāri is, of course, mentioned also in all the *Prabandhas*. In the *Prabhāvakacarita* of the XXII, 691, we read that it was announced in the whole kingdom with the sound of drums. In the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* pp. 211, 243 it is said that the edict was issued for a limited period of fourteen years. In the *Kumārāpālacarita* it is mentioned on p. 144, line 16, pp. 152, ff., and many details are given, which repeat and extend the accounts of the *Dnyāsaṅga* and of the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*.

84. *Prabhāvakacarita* XXII, 690-691; *Kumārāpālacarita* p. 154.

85. *Prabhāvakacarita* XXII, 692-702; *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* pp. 216-217; *Kumārāpālacarita* p. 206, where an anecdote of a certain case is also related; *Kirtukamudī* II, 43-44. The *Prabhāvakacarita* remarks in verse 693 expressly that it was the merchants (*vyavahārin*) whose fortune was confiscated if they died without leaving sons. The passage, just mentioned in the *Abhijñānasākuntala*, is to be found in the 6th Act, pp. 138-139, ed. Pischel.

86 The very much spoiled verses, *Prabhāvakṛantīra* XXII, 603-609, refer to the Kumāra-vihāra. There is a second passage about the buildings: verses 633-682, where we read:

प्रासादेः सप्तद्वयेऽथ यवायणौ(?) मदीपतिः ।
 द्वात्रिंशत् विहारानां सारण्यां निरमगयत् ॥ ६८३ ॥
 द्वौ शुभौ द्वौ च - - द्वौ रत्नोत्पलवर्णौ ।
 द्वौ भीमौ पोद्ग्राय स्तुः प्रासादाः कनकप्रभाः ॥ ६८४ ॥
 श्रीरोहिणिश्च समचसरणं प्रमुखादुका ।
 अतोऽविदयी चैवं द्वात्रिंशत्स्थापितस्तदा ॥ ६८५ ॥
 चतुर्विंशतिचैलेषु श्रीमन्त भूपमादयः ।
 सोमन्धरायाश्चत्वारो चतुर्षु मिलयेषु य[न] ॥ ६८६ ॥
 द्वात्रिंशतः पूरणाणामनृणास्ततिर्गमितम्(?) ।
 व्यतिष्ठन् शोभोर्भू[त] पूर्ववासात्सुसारवः ॥ ६८७ ॥
 स पञ्चविंशतिवता हूलमानो अनेकाः ।
 श्रीमत्सिद्धुणसारुण्ये पञ्चविंशतिरुक्ते ॥ ६८८ ॥
 विहरिस्थायन्त श्रीमान् नेमिनायोपरति ।
 समप्रदेशस्थानेषु जैनचैत्यान्वयीकरम् ॥ ६८९ ॥

Homacandra's advice, upon which Kumārapāla was to build 32 temples as penance for the sins of his 32 teeth, is to be found, *loc. cit* verso 701. Thirdly, in verses 722-726, there is an account of a temple in Śātruñjaya, which was 24 *koṭas* high, and which, as the author adds, is still to be seen at present.

The fourth passage consists of verses 807-821:

एवं कृपापयम् जन्म सप्तसेव्या धनं वपन् ।
 चक्रे सम्प्रतिवर्जनभवनैर्गणितं मदीयम् ॥ ८०७ ॥
 श्रीमल्लकान्मणं दृष्ट स्तोपश्चमखोन्मदा ।
 व्याचख्युर्नृपतेर्धर्मस्थितीकरणहेतवे ॥ ८०८ ॥
 श्रीमहावीरवृत्तं च व्याख्यात[व्यः] सुखोन्मदा ।
 देवाधिदेवसंघर्ष[वर्ण्य] व्याचख्युर्नृपतेः पुरः ॥ ८०९ ॥
 यथा प्रभावती देवी मृगालोद्वनप्रिया ।
 श्रीचैतकावनीपालपुत्री तस्या यथा पुरा ॥ ८१० ॥
 वारिषी घन[व्यन्त]रा कश्चिदाद्वयं महालक्षम् ।
 सप्तमीवर्षास्यर्ष[वृ]त्तं व्याख्यात[व्यः] संपु[न]द्वन्द्वम् ॥ ८११ ॥
 एनं देवाधिदेवं च उपलक्षयित्वा प्रमुम् ।
 स भक्ताराधितान्(?) हस्तुं चास्ति तिस्रोदये ॥ ८१२ ॥
 पुरे बीतमये यातपात्रे संप्रति यथा ।
 अन्यैर्नोद्वादिनं देव्या वीराक्याया [स्यका] भक्तमितः [तम्] ॥ ८१३ ॥
 यथा प्रद्योतराजस्य हस्तं स प्रतिमा गता ।
 दास्या तत्प्रतिमिदं च मुक्तं पद्मपुरे यथा ॥ ८१४ ॥
 शम्भुगौरवसीता च वा[न] तया वर्णिता कथा ।
 श्रीवीरचरिताद्भो[ज्ये]षा तस्यां श्रुतिलक्षौतुके ॥ ८१५ ॥
 यदभि- कलकम् ॥
 तां श्रुत्वा मूर्धनिः कलहस्ताभिर्दुष्प्रविष्टी (?) ।
 ज्ञेयं बीतमये क[श्च]न्नेवी[शी]तवत्तद् मुञ्चं क्षणम् ॥ ८१६ ॥

राजमन्दिरमालोचय भुवोमुन[रोन्त]स्तित्तिदिता ।
 देवतामसत्स्थान प्राप्तिर्विद्वं तथाहंत ॥ ८१७ ॥
 आनीतं च विभो राजधानीमतिशयोक्तैः ।
 त प्रयेत[त] दृष्टे तस्य सौधदेवतवेदमनि ॥ ८१८ ॥
 प्रासाद स्फाटिकस्तत्र तयोय्य पृथिवीभृता ।
 प्रसिन्धेय निविद्ध प्रमुनिर्भाविदेहिभिः ॥ ८१९ ॥
 राजप्रासादमध्ये च न हि देवपु[र]हं भवेत् ।
 इत्यगान्या[मात्र]मवलुह्य न्यपदेत ततो नृप ॥ ८२० ॥
 एकादपवर्ता जैनयासतस्य प्रकाशयत्[त्र] ।
 शिष्यात्वसौलव्य श्रीहेमचन्द्रप्रसूचयै ॥ ८२१ ॥

The same story is told in the *Kumarapālacarita* pp 264, f.

87. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* pp 216, 219, 231, 232, 238 Jinamandana repeats the accounts of his predecessors and gives us nothing new of importance, except that on p 232, he brings the number of restorations made by Kumarapala up to 16 000

88 The minister Yasodhavalā is mentioned in the colophon at the bottom of a MS of the *Kalpasaṁgraha* Kielhorn, *Report*, App, p 11. Somesvara in the *Prasasti* (*Kirtikāumudī* App A, pp 5 and 14, verse 35) tells us of Yasodhavalā the Paramāra prince of Candravatī and Acalagadh, that he fought with Kumarapala against Malva and killed king Ballala. The *Prabhāvakāśarita* knows that he was placed upon the throne by Kumarapala after the sentence of his uncle Vikramasimha. Vikramasimha is not mentioned by Somesvara but, on the other hand, he is mentioned in the *Dvayārayamahātmya*. The princes of Candravatī were not very powerful, and were vassals of the Caulukyas in the 12th and 13th centuries. It is therefore not improbable that Yasodhavalā was for a time Kumārpalas Pradhān. About Kapardin see, for instance, *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* pp 226-230, according to the *Prabandhakaṇṭha*, p 102 he was a Paramara Rajput

89 Unfortunately I am not in a position to make quite exact statements as to the extent of this work, as I have only been able to see a few extracts - the *Jamāramāyana* printed in Calcutta, the *Paras'ṭaparvan* published by H. Jacob in the *Bibliotheca Indica* and the MS of the Royal Asiatic Society, which contains the eighth *Parvan*. The MS of the Deccan College, No 47, *Coll.* of 1874/76, in which the *Parvans* I, II, IV are missing, is written upon 715 leaves, with 15 lines on a side. The Cambay Bhandari contains palm leaf MSS of *Parvan* I (Peterson, *First Rep* p 87) II (Peterson, *First Rep*, p 19), III (Peterson, *First Rep* A, p 11, *Third Rep* A, p 124), VII (Peterson, *First Rep* A, p 23, *Third Rep*, A, p 145) VIII (Peterson, *First Rep* A, p 34, *Third Rep*, A, p 144), X (Peterson, *First Rep* A, p 35) and of the *Paras'ṭaparvan* (Peterson, *First Rep*, p 35). Jinamandana's account is to be found in the *Kumarapālacarita* p 235, line 16 and is probably approximately correct.

90 I discovered this work (see *Report on S. MSS* 1879/80, pp 2, 3) in a MS, where it follows the text of the Sanskrit *Dvayārayamahātmya*. As regards other MSS, see Peterson, *Third Rep*, p 19 and Kielhorn, *Report for 1880/81*, p 77, No 374. It contains only 950 *śloka*s together with the Commentary. Quotations from it are to be found in Jinamandana, *Kumarapālacarita* p 194. The latter are the only parts of the little work, which are now available to me.

91 See Böhtlingk and Bien, *Abhūdhānacintāmaṇi* p VII

92 The verses in question, according to my copy from No 702, *Deccan College Collection* 1876/77, read -

श्रीहेमचरितोपेय श्रीमन्महेश्वरीणा ।
 भक्तिनिष्ठेन रीत्येव तथाहंत प्रतिष्ठिता ॥ १ ॥

97. *Prabandhaśintāmaṇi*, p. 233 and pp. 234-35. Both the stories stand in a reverse order in the *Kumārāpālacarita*, pp. 190 and 191.

98. *Prabhāvakacarita* XXII, 703 ff., *Prabandhaśintāmaṇi*, p. 237, *Kumārāpālacarita*, pp. 246 f

99. *Prabandhaśintāmaṇi*, pp. 240, *Prabandhakosa*, pp. 112 ff., *Kumārāpālacarita*, pp. 268 ff

100. *Kumārāpālacarita*, p. 267

101. *Prabhāvakacarita* XXII, 731 ff., *Prabandhaśintāmaṇi*, pp. 223 f., *Kumārāpālacarita*, pp. 188 f

102. *Prabandhaśintāmaṇi*, pp. 243 f., *Prabandhakosa*, pp. 100 f., *Kumārāpālacarita*, pp. 156 ff and 272 ff

103. The first story is found in the *Kumārāpālacarita*, pp. 213 f. The second one, which stands on pp. 267 f., at the end of the work, is in close relation to the Brahmin legend about Śaṅkarācārya and Hemācārya, communicated by K. Forbes, *Rās Malā*, pp. 155 f. The latter is probably only an adaptation of the Jaina legend in the Brahmin spirit.

104. *Prabhāvakacarita* XXII, 710 ff., *Kumārāpālacarita*, pp. 236 f. By ordinary palm-trees, the Phoenix sylvestris or *Khaṇḍava*, which is common in Western India, is probably meant, by the *Sritālas*, the specimens of the *Borassus flabelliformis*, rarer in Gujarat, are probably meant.

105. *Prabhāvakacarita* XXII, 769, ff. The remaining *Prabandhas*, too, maintain that Kumārāpala presented his kingdom to Hemacandra. The motive for this is, however, given differently.

106. *Kumārāpālacarita*, p. 146

107. *Kumārāpālacarita*, pp. 211-223. At the end of the work, on p. 279, there is a further list of *Dvandas*, which diverges in many points.

108. *Prabhāvakacarita* XXII, 850 f., *Prabandhaśintāmaṇi*, pp. 237 f., *Prabandhakosa*, pp. 102 ff and p. 112, *Kumārāpālacarita*, p. 243 and p. 270

109. *Prabhāvakacarita* XXII, 852-53, *Prabandhaśintāmaṇi*, pp. 244 f., *Kumārāpālacarita*, pp. 236 ff. As Jinasaudana's account of the manner of Kumārāpala's death may possibly contain historical elements, it may be given in full. It runs (on pp. 284 f.) as follows:

नत. श्रीगुरविरहासुरी राजा यावद् दैर्घ्यं प्रवपमहं राज्ये नियेतपति यावद् किंचिद्विहृत राजवर्गसेदोऽजयपालो भ्रातृभ्यः श्रीकुमारपालदेवस्य विपमदात् । तेन विधुरितमात्रे राजा ज्ञातवत्प्रथमं स्वां विपाथहारश्रुक्तिको कोशस्थः श्रीमन्मानव-
तेन निजसमुत्पन्नानादिदेश । ते च तौ युगपजयपालमृष्टीया यावत् कृषीं लिखा । अत्रान्वरे अश्रुते समस्तजलोके विपा-
[ग]हारे[र]श्रुतेनाग[म]ह[र]िं ज्ञात्वा कोऽपि पपाठ । ... इत्याकथ्य याव[व]द् राज्ञ[ज] विमुक्तति यावत् कोऽपि भास-
कस्य । कृतकलोऽपि भूपाल कलिकालेऽपि मृतके । अमप्रवति तेन त्वां शा.....विधि । इयोर्लक्षं लक्षं दत्त्वा शिशाना-
ममहेतुं सावय ।

अभिभ्यः कनकस दीपकपिता विभ्रागिवा कोटयो
वादेयु प्रतिवादितां प्रतिहत्वा शस्त्रार्थगमां गिरः ।
उद्धान्[वत्साह] प्रतिरोषितैर्नृपतिभिः सरीरेव क्रोडितं
कर्तव्यं कृतमयेना यदि विपेक्षयापि सव्यं वयम् ॥

इत्युदीर्य दशधाराधनीं कृत्वा मृष्टीतानसानी वर्ष ३० भास ८ दिवसात् २७ राज्ये कृत्वा कुवायीं कृतपुरपाथः

सर्वज्ञं हृदि संसारं गुह्यनि श्रीहेमचन्द्रप्रभुं
धर्मं चतुर्वर्त्तं च कल्पपत्रपीपशालनाशुफलं ।
श्रीमोक्षदत्तं १२३० वसरे विल[प]लहृद्युक्तविमृष्टांयरी
मृगवाप कुमारपालमृष्टि स ध्य[म]न्त्ययीतवान् ॥

The omitted line contains a hopelessly mutilated Prakrit verse.

INDEX.

| | PAGES. |
|---|--------------------|
| Abhaya | 33, 43. |
| Abhidhānacintāmani ... | 18, 36 f., 49. |
| Abhijñānaśākuntala... | 44. |
| Ahmedabad | 6. |
| Ajmeru (Ajmer) | 28, 37. |
| Ajayadeva (Ajayapāla) | 3, 57. |
| Ajitasvāmin | 28, 34. |
| Alaṃkāracūḍāmaṇi ... | 10, 18 f., 36. |
| Alaṃkāraśāstra | 36. |
| Alhapa | 38. |
| Ambikā | 21, 25. |
| Amiga | 20, 29. |
| Āmrabhata (Āmbaḍ) | 29, 35, 51, 54, 57 |
| Ānā | 53. |
| Anekārthakairatīkalāmudī | 49. |
| Anekārthaloṣa | 15, 49 f. |
| Anekārthasaṃgraha | 18. |
| Aphilvād 16, 20, 25 f., 28-31, 33, 44-46, | 48, 50, 52, 57. |
| Arbuda (Ābū) | 28. |
| Arnorāja | 28 f., 33 f., 37. |
| Ārya-Raṣṣita | 3. |
| Baal, the priests of | 52. |
| Balacandra | 50, 57. |
| Ballāla | 33. |
| ni | 17. |
| lrahāli | 32. |

| | PAGES. |
|---|-------------------|
| Bhima I | 25. |
| Bhinmāl | 9. |
| Bhīṣmas | 20. |
| Bhoja... .. | 15, 17. |
| Bhopāladevi | 26. |
| Bosari | 26. |
| Brāhmī, goddess | 26. |
| Brāhmideśa (Kāśmīr) ... | 10. |
| Brhadertti | 10. |
| Brhaspati .. 52 f.; Bhāva... 47, Gaṇḍa | 50. |
| Broach (Bhṛgukaceha) ... | 29, 30, 32. |
| | 27, 35, 51. |
| Cāciga | 8 f. |
| Cakravartin | 3. |
| Cakuladevi | 25. |
| Cambay (Stambhatirtha) 6, 9, 26 f., 46, | 48, 50, 56. |
| Candra Gaccha | 10. |
| Candraprabha, temple of ... | 53. |
| Candravati | 46. |
| Caṅgadeva, Caṅgadeva (H.'s worldly | name)... 6 f., 9. |
| Caritras | 3. |
| Caturmukha, temple of ... | 19. |
| Chandonuśāsana | 18 f., 36. |
| Chronicles of the Arabs ... | 3. |
| " " " Middle Ages, Europen | 3. |

| | PAGES. | | PAGES. |
|---|----------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Cūdāsamā | 35. | Jayasimha Siddharāja 5, 9, 12 ff, 15, 17, 19, 21-27, 32, 36, 46, 48, 53. | |
| Dāhala | 22. | Jesalmir | 50. |
| Dāji, Bhau | 1. | Jholikāvihāra | 46. |
| Dasārhas | 42. | Jinamandana | 2 and <i>passim</i> . |
| Dattasūri | 10. | Jodhpur | 37. |
| Delhi | 2. | | |
| <i>Deśināmamālā</i> | 36-38. | Kākala, Kakkala, Kakkalla... .. | 16f. |
| Dethli | 26. | Kālidāsa | 44. |
| Devabodha | 20. | <i>Kakhalasarcvajña</i> (title conferred upon H.) | 53. |
| Devabodhi | 39, 46, 53f. | Kaliyuga | 2, 53f. |
| Devacandra | 6, 10, 18, 27. | Kalyāṇa | 27. |
| Devapattana | 32f., 45f., 48, 52-54, 56. | Kalyāṇa-kataka | 53. |
| Devaprasāda | 25. | Kāñci | 27. |
| Devasūri | 10, 14, 17. | Kanoj | 46. |
| Dhanayddhi | 44. | Kāṇhada (Kṛṣṇa) | 25. |
| Dhandhukā | 6, 46, 56. | Kantesvari | 52. |
| <i>Dhanvantarinighanṭu</i> | 37. | Kāpāhka | 26. |
| Dharmarāja | 35. | Kapardin | 46. |
| Digambaras | 45. | Karambavihāra | 40. |
| Dikṣāvihāra | 9, 46. | Karka | 18. |
| Dronas | 20. | Karna ... 25, the ruler of Dāhala | 53. |
| Dusyanta | 44. | Karnas | 20. |
| <i>Dvyaśrayamahākāvya</i> 5, 19, 18f., 21, 33f., 36, 41, 43f., 48, 56. | | Karnāvatī | 9, 31. |
| Elijas | 52. | <i>Kātantra</i> | 17. |
| Forbes, K. | 1. | <i>Kathākosa</i> | 20. |
| Garhwal | 33. | Kāthiāvāḍ | 6, 12. |
| Girnār | 20f., 23, 29, 46, 56. | Kedāra | 20. |
| Gold, the art of making | 10. | Kedāranātha, temple of | 33, 46. |
| Gunacandra, Gaṇin | 4, 17f., 50, 57. | Kelhaṇa | 38, 44. |
| Guṇasena | 10. | Kielhorn | 17. |
| Harṣavardhana | 46. | <i>Kirtikāumudī</i> | 44. |
| Hemacandra | 1 and <i>passim</i> . | Kollāpur | 27. |
| Hemakhaṇḍa | 57. | Konkan | 29. |
| Hsuen Tsiang | 46. | Kotikagana | 10. |
| Indra | 34. | Kotinagara (Koḍināra) | 21. |
| Jaina libraries | 2. | Kṛpāsundarī | 35. |
| Jambūsvāmin | 48. | Kṛṣṇadeva (Kāṇhaḍadeva) | 26f. |
| | | Kṣemarāja | 25. |
| | | Kubera | 34. |
| | | Kumārāpāla | 5, 19-21, 23, 29. |